

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXIV, 2.

WHOLE No. 94.

I.—UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF WILHELM MÜLLER.

A peculiar youthful freshness has given the poems of Wilhelm Müller (born October 7, 1794; died September 30, 1827) a definite place in German literature, which, after the test of nearly a century, gives good promise of being permanent. Müller's greatest service was doubtless that of demonstrating by successful example how the materials of older popular poetry could be drawn upon to enliven and enrich the lyric of more modern times. Heine, in his well-known letter of June 7, 1826, confesses his obligations to Müller in terms which could hardly be more outspoken; he frankly admits that the metrical form of his best songs, as well as their artless singing quality, were borrowed directly from our poet:

Ich bin gross genug, Ihnen offen zu bekennen, dass mein kleines "Intermezzo" Metrum nicht bloss zufällige Ähnlichkeit mit Ihrem gewöhnlichen Metrum hat, sondern dass es wahrscheinlich seinen geheimsten Tonfall Ihren Liedern verdankt, indem es die lieben Müllerschen Lieder waren, die ich zu eben der Zeit kennen lernte, als ich das "Intermezzo" schrieb. Ich habe sehr früh schon das deutsche Volkslied auf mich einwirken lassen; aber ich glaube erst in Ihren Liedern den reinen Klang und die wahre Einfachheit, wonach ich immer strebte, gefunden zu haben. Wie rein, wie klar sind Ihre Lieder, und sämtlich sind es Volkslieder. In meinen Gedichten hingegen ist nur die Form einigermassen volkstümlich, der Inhalt gehört der konventionellen Gesellschaft. Ja, ich bin gross genug, es sogar bestimmt zu wiederholen, und Sie werden es mal öffentlich ausgesprochen finden, dass mir durch die Lektüre Ihrer 77 Gedichte zuerst klar geworden, wie man aus den alten vor-

handenen Volksliederformen neue Formen bilden kann, die ebenfalls volkstümlich sind, ohne dass man nötig hat, die alten Sprachholperigkeiten und Unbeholfenheiten nachzuahmen! Im zweiten Teile Ihrer Gedichte fand ich die Form noch reiner, noch durchsichtig klarer—doch, was spreche ich viel von Formwesen, es drängt mich mehr, Ihnen zu sagen, dass ich keinen Liederdichter ausser Goethe so sehr liebe, wie Sie.

The total destruction of the poet's library by fire almost eliminated the usual sources of biography, and the rather meagre sketches by Gustav Schwab (1827) Karl Goedeke, and Professor Max Müller, the son of the poet (in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*), remained for many years the only important contributions to our information. After the death of Max Müller (October 28, 1900), his widow entrusted to Mr. Philip Allen and the present writer a very interesting private diary and twenty-four unpublished letters (mostly addressed to the poet's wife), which have lately appeared in the University of Chicago Press (*Diary and Letters of Wilhelm Müller*, 1903).

During the summer of 1902 I succeeded in finding the fifteen letters which are here printed. All but two are in possession of the manuscript department of the Royal Library in Berlin. Number 8 is in the well-known private collection of Herr Alexander Meyer Cohn in Berlin, Number 13 belongs to the Ducal Library at Gotha (Cod. Goth. chart. A. 1311, N. 7.). To Professor Stern, of the Berlin Royal Library, Professor Rudolf Ewald, Librarian at Gotha, Professor Ludwig Geiger, and Herr Meyer Cohn I beg to express my thanks for their generous and cordial assistance.

In the *Deutsche Rundschau* for March, 1902, I attempted to give an estimate of the poet, viewed in the light of more recently discovered materials. To that portrait the present correspondence lends no new essential traits, though it offers in some degree a more favorable view of Müller's strenuousness in literary and scholarly work. In both of these fields we find him constantly busy and productive, even though we must deplore a too easy conception of the responsibility which such activity imposes.

I. TO FRIEDRICH AUGUST WOLF.

Wien den 12^{ten} Oktober 1817.

Verehrter Herr Geheimerath,

Ich halte es für meine Pflicht, Ihnen meine Erkenntlichkeit für die freundlichen Empfehlungen, die Sie mir nach Wien

gegeben haben, zu bezeigen. Wenn mein zweimonatlicher Aufenthalt in dieser Stadt nicht allein angenehm, sondern auch für die Fortsetzung meiner Reise von dem besten Nutzen war, so bin ich Ihnen zunächst dafür verbunden. Denn, obschon Anthimus Gazes nicht in Wien ist, sondern die Stadt, (abgesehen von seinem gelehrten Rufe) nicht mit dem besten Rufe verlassen und sich nach Odessa begeben hat,—ferner Alexander Basilii als Türkischer Konsul in Triest wohnt—so war mir doch der Name Ihres Schülers Empfehlung genug bei allen Griechen. Der Nachfolger des Gazes, Theocletus, Mitherausgeber des *Hermes Logius*, übernahm die Besorgung Ihres Briefes an Alexander Basilii und schon in 8 Tagen hatte ich von letzterem eine Menge offener Empfehlungsbriefe nach allen Gegenden Griechenlands und Kleinasien in Händen.

Derselbe Theocletus, so wie der andere Herausgeber des *Hermes*, Kokinakis, erbieten sich mir zu Lehrern in der Römischen Sprache. Ich habe keinen Tag versäumt, von ihrem Anerbieten Gebrauch zu machen: da die Geschäfte dieser Herren aber sehr gross sind, so haben sie mir einen dritten griechischen Gelehrten zum professor ordinarius gegeben, (Doctor Athanasius Bogorides) während ich bei den beiden andern nur zuweilen hospitire.—Wenn die Aussprache des Römischen und die Accentherrschaft nur nicht wären, so würde es mit meinen Fortschritten schneller gehn.

Die Pest in Constantinopel hat übrigens unsren Reiseplan umgekehrt. Wir reisen Ende dieses Monats nach Italien ab—u so wird der Rath, den Sie mir gegeben, (Italien eher als Griechenland zu sehn) durch das Schicksal ausgeführt. Ich werde dann Alexander Basilii in Triest sehen und ihm persönlich für seine Freundlichkeit danken. Wir denken uns in Neapel oder Tarent einzuschiffen, nach Corfu und von da nach Epirus zu gehn.

Ich freue mich, Ihnen in den Überbringern dieses Briefes zwei englische Reisende vorzustellen, deren Bekanntschaft Ihnen nicht uninteressant sein wird. Der eine, Mr. Legh, wird Ihnen aus seiner Reise (*Narrative of a Journey through Egypt* pp) bekannt sein. Der andere, Dr. Macmichael war sein Begleiter auf einer Reise durch Griechenland, im Jahre 1812. Sie waren beide bei der Auffindung des bekannten Friezes in Phigalia und haben ausserdem in Athen nicht unbedeutende Alterthümer ausgegraben. Auch können Sie von ihnen manches über die Reise von Stackelnberg, Haller, Link pp erfahren, mit denen sie eine Zeit lang Gemeinschaft gemacht haben.

Mit inniger Hochachtung

Ihr

dankbarer Schüler

WILHELM MÜLLER.

Der HE Baron von Sack, der durch ein Missverständniss (er glaubte Sie nach Rügen abgereist, während es Ihr Namens-

bruder, Professor am Joachimsthal war) das Vergnügen Ihrer persönlichen Bekanntschaft versäumt hat, empfiehlt sich Ihnen.

In August, 1817, after having completed his studies at the University of Berlin, Wilhelm Müller received a very gratifying honor from the Royal Academy of Sciences. That body had been requested by the Prussian Baron von Sack, a rich dilettante, who was about to undertake a semi-scholastic journey to Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt, to appoint a suitable young scholar to be his companion. The Academy, doubtless on recommendation of Wolf, to whom Müller stood in very close relations as a favorite disciple, nominated the poet. A commission from the historical-philological section of the Academy, dated August 20, 1817, and signed by Buttmann, is extant. It authorizes Müller to collect inscriptions in Greece, Asia, etc., and to introduce himself to the learned native societies in Corfu, Chios, and Athens. The foregoing letter gives the first explanation of the interruption of the trip at Vienna, which has hitherto been accounted for by the very suspicious theory of Müller's own solicitations, prompted by his yearning for Italy.

Müller's enthusiastic study of classical antiquity is shown to be the medium through which he came to acquire his keen interest in modern Greece. His vigorous two-months' work upon the language in Constantinople at this time is an important step in the process which brought him to be the poet and prophet of the Greek War of Liberation. His passionate zeal for the cause of Greek independence was no ephemeral conceit, but was based upon solid acquaintance with the movement and its leaders. Anthimus Gazes (or Gazis) was one of the first promoters of Greek independence, and in 1816 travelled through Greece in order to gain adherents to the "Hetaireia" movement. Kok(k)inakis had made himself a name in the literature of his native tongue, more particularly by his translations of modern European dramas. The *Δόγιος Ἑρμῆς* was a successful modern Greek literary journal published in Vienna, but given up on the outbreak of the revolution.

It is not without significance that Müller sends this letter by English acquaintances: the young poet's deep interest in the English nation and national literature had already shown itself in various ways, and was to bear further fruit in a translation of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, a biography of Byron, and a long series of publications upon British writers. This predilection

sheds some light, as well, upon the unique position which Professor Max Müller, the German, occupied as a typical member of English society. Thomas Legh's Narrative of a Journey in Egypt and the Country beyond the Cataracts had appeared in London in the preceding year, and was republished in Philadelphia as early as 1817.

2. TO HELMINA VON CHÉZY.

Berlin den (Geniale Leute schreiben
keinen Datum über die Briefe.)

Es sollen heute drei Briefe von dreien Freunden an drei Freunde geschrieben werden, oder um grammatischer zu sprechen, an eine Freundin u zwei Freunde, u wir fangen an mit dem Ihrigen, weil Einer von uns in Rom erfahren haben will, dass das schicklich sei. Übrigens bin ich von Dessau nach Berlin gekommen, bloss um zwei faule Briefschreiber, deren einen ich schon die Ehre gehabt habe zu nennen,* zu ermuntern, nicht länger zu zögern, Ihnen zu sagen, was Sie in der Folge lesen werden. Dass ich selbst aber Ihnen nicht früher geschrieben habe, das hat den sehr zarten Grund, Sie, werthe Freundin, nicht durch die Erinnerung an mich an den schrecklichen Augenblick unsers Abschiedes in Dresden zu erinnern. Nunmehr hoffe ich ist die Wunde verharscht, die Ihnen der Tod Ihres lieben Vogels geschlagen hatte, dessen unschuldiger Zeuge ich sein musste u der unsren Abschied eben so erschrecklich rührend machte, und ich darf es wagen, mich bei Ihrem Gedächtnisse wieder zu melden.¹ . . .

Ich habe vor Kurzem in den Zeitungen gelesen, dass jetzt eine Taubenpost zwischen Antwerpen u London angelegt worden ist, u zwar mit bestem Erfolge. Ob die sich wohl dazu gebrauchen liessen, die Poste restante Briefe für Sie aus dem Gedankenbureau meines Freundes abzuholen? Dann wäre es wünschenswerth, dass recht bald eine solche Post auch zwischen Dresden u Berlin angelegt würde, die N. B. über Dessau passiren müsste.— Es ist eine erschreckliche Hitze, Atterbom klagt mich an, dass ich ihn zu Grunde richte mit Briefschreiben, Hensel will baden, und ich kann nicht fort.—O weh, o weh, da hab' ich die ganze Bescheerung verrathen, nun aber radire ich keinen Buchstaben wieder aus.

Ich weiss nicht, ob Sie schon wissen, dass ich jetzt nur zum Besuche in Berlin bin u zugleich in Angelegenheiten der oben erwähnten² unsterblichen Reisebeschreibung, die gegen Weihnachten, unter dem Titel *Rom, Römer u Römerinnen* bei Duncker

* Aber ich habe den Namen wieder auskratzen müssen, damit Sie rathen sollen, wer es ist.

¹ Here follow the passages by Atterbom and Hensel.

² In Atterbom's part of the letter.

u Humblot erscheinen wird. In Dessau stelle ich Bücher auf, meublire meine Stuben aus u teutonisire gelegentlich die Jugend in einigen vaterländischen Geschichtsstunden. Zum neuen Jahre soll ich ein Journal herausgeben; wenn der Buchhändler mich noch dazu überredet, so werde ich meine Redaktionspflicht damit beginnen, Sie u unsre Freunde in Dresden zur fleissigen Theilnahme daran zu überreden. Ich bin in Dessau nicht unzufrieden: der Ort ist, wie Sie wissen werden, nicht unfreundlich, wenigstens giebt es vor den Thoren grüne Bäume u in den Thoren rothe Backen: das überrascht schon angenehm, wenn man aus Berlins Sandwüsten u Bleichsuchtlazarethen kömmt. Mein Italien trage ich aber in mir. *Luise Brachmann* ist jetzt in Berlin u hat mich wegen meiner Rezension ihrer Erzählung im *Erzähler* niederträchtig gemacht. Wir haben uns aber wieder versöhnt, u ich will nun keine Dame wieder recensiren.

The above is an undated, unsigned letter written jointly by Wilhelm Müller, the Swedish poet Atterbom¹ (who from 1817 to 1819 travelled in Germany and Italy), and Müller's most intimate friend, the artist Wilhelm Hensel, later the husband of Fanny Mendelssohn. Internal evidence shows that the letter belongs to the end of the summer of 1819. It is addressed to the remarkably gifted, and no less "terrible" Frau Helmina von Chézy, of whose brilliant circle Müller had been a regular member during her sojourn in Berlin in 1816 and 1817. Müller first mentions her in his diary for May 23, 1816. In October 1817 she had moved to Dresden, where Müller had probably seen her at the close of 1818, on his return from Italy. Her intense temperament doubtless made the incident of the death of the bird a highly tragic one,—if we may judge from similar scenes recorded in the memoirs of her son Wilhelm.

Rom, Römer und Römerinnen, two volumes of familiar letters from Italy, appeared early in 1820. The "Teutonizing" of German youth was a peculiarly congenial occupation to one who had been conspicuous among that group of younger Romanticists in Berlin, which was chiefly bound together by common enthusiasm for the glories of medieval Germany, and for all the wealth of its coloring. The members of this set went about the streets of Berlin in long hair, velvet barrets, and broad collars, worshipped the old painters of the Cologne school and thoroughly despised French narrowness and the delusion of cosmopolitanism.

The fate of the "journal" (*Askania*) is mentioned in connection with the following letter.

¹ 1790-1855.

The above letter gives the only known indication of Müller's acquaintance with Luise Brachmann, the ill-starred "Sappho" of Dresden.

3. CIRCULAR LETTER.

Ew. Hochwohlgeboren

zeige ich ergebenst an, dass ich vom ersten Januar nächsten Jahres an eine Zeitschrift unter dem Titel:

Askania,
oder

Anhaltische Blätter für Leben, Litteratur und Kunst

herausgeben werde. Die Namen *Askania* und *Anhalt* wollen nur den Ort ihrer Erscheinung bezeichnen und keines Weges ein Provinzialblatt ankündigen. Die *Askania* wird sich bestreben in der Fluth eleganter Zeitschriften eine freie Eigenthümlichkeit zu behaupten und statt eiteln buntscheckigen Zeitvertreibes gefälligen Stoff geistiger Bildung dar zu bieten. Daher werden ihr Abhandlungen über jedweden Gegenstand des Lebens, der Litteratur und der Kunst, Rezensionen beurtheilswerther Bücher, Auszüge aus nicht genug bekannt gewordenen oder zu früh vergessenen u. s. w. willkommener sein, als Erzählungen oder Gedichte; und Theaterkorrespondenzen, Anekdotenkrämereien und miszellanische Lückenbüssereien sollen gänzlich von ihr ausgeschlossen bleiben. Eine strenge Auswahl und das Verfolgen eines festen Zieles, das ich nicht näher anzudeuten brauche, indem ich Ew. Hochwohlgeboren zur Theilnahme an der *Askania* einlade, ist sie den würdigen Freunden schuldig, die ihre gütige Unterstützung theils bereits versprochen haben, theils mit Zuversicht hoffen lassen, und sie wird vorläufig nur zwei Blätter wöchentlich, jedes von einem halben Bogen, ausgeben, um sich auf keine Weise in der Befolgung ihrer kritischen Grundsätze gehemmt zu fühlen.

Ich ersuche Ew. Hochwohlgeboren ergebenst, unsre Zeitschrift mit Ihren schätzbaren Beiträgen zu beehren und Ihre erste Sendung wo möglich noch vor dem Schlusse des laufenden Jahres an die Verlagshandlung zu befördern, welche das Honorar, das vorläufig auf zehn Thaler für den gedruckten Bogen festgesetzt worden ist, drei Monate nach dem Abdrucke der Handschrift auszahlen wird.

In Erwartung einer baldigen Gewährung meiner Bitte habe ich die Ehre mich mit hoher Achtung zu empfehlen.

Dessau, am 1ten September 1819.

WILHELM MÜLLER.

Enclosed in Number 4; a printed invitation to contributors. The words "Hochwohlgeboren" and the final signature are written in ink.

The first copy of *Askania* appeared in January, 1820; after six numbers had been printed, the journal went the way of the honorable host of similar literary and aesthetic ventures. A number of well-known writers, such as Jakob Grimm, Kalckreuth, Karl Förster, and Achim von Arnim contributed to it, but on June 15, 1820, Müller writes to Karl Förster of the complete failure of the enterprise. The reading public totally ignored it, so that, on the average, less than 150 copies had been sold each month.

4. TO HELMINA VON CHÉZY.

Dessau, den 14^{ten} September 19.

Nicht umsonst habe ich Sie neulich von Berlin aus anonymiter mit der Einladung zu einem Journale *bedroht!* Sehn Sie, wie fest mein Vertrauen auf Ihre Güte ist, dass ich damit drohen durfte, als wäre eine abschlägige Antwort gar nicht möglich. Nun möchte ich Ihnen Vieles von den schönen, erhabenen Plänen sagen, die ich mir bei der Herausgabe meiner Blätter vorgesetzt habe z. B. dass ich selbst keine Silbe daran schreiben will, und dass ich grössere Aufsätze ununterbrochen durch mehrere Nummern hindurch führen werde, und dass ich das Journal mit einem Gedichte von Helmina von Chézy eröffnen will—aber da fällt mir ein, dass das noch zu früh ist.

Ich habe an HE v. Malsburg, Karl Förster, Friedrich Kuhn Einladungsbriefe geschickt. Wenn Sie die Herren sehen, grüssen Sie sie von mir und legen eine Fürbitte ein, besonders bei HE von Malsburg. Den Brief an Graf Löben habe ich eingelegt, weil ich nicht weiss, ob er noch in Dresden ist. Den Brief an Gebauer bitte ich ebenfalls durch Buchhändlergelegenheit zu besorgen, da ich selbst nicht weiss, wo er ist. Noch nicht genug! Sie erhalten noch zwei Wohlgeborene Briefe und zwei Hochwohlgeborene ohne Adressen: wenn Sie ein paar Wohlgeborene und ein paar Hochwohlgeborene Dichter oder Prosaiker wissen, die durch Ihre gütige Fürsprache für mich zu gewinnen wären, so setzen Sie Adressen darauf u schicken sie fort.

Da ich nun einmal unverschämt gewesen bin, so will ich's nun mit einem Male abthun. Ich möchte mir nemlich Diess u Jenes bei Ihnen für mein Journal bestellen z. B. eine recht *lange* Rezension von Malsburgs Kalderon, ein paar Legenden ppp

Unser lieber Atterbom ist nun schon über dem Meere. Ich habe in Berlin noch einige recht herrliche Stunden mit ihm zugebracht: ich reiste eigentlich bloss seinetwegen dorthin. Sonst widersteht mir Berlin. Bei Hensel erfreute mich Ihr heitres Bild: es ist ein Meisterstück.

Nächsten Sommer komm' ich gewiss einmal nach Dresden—dann bin ich schon ein berühmter Mann, von wegen der Redaktion und der vortrefflichen Römischen Reisebeschreibung,

die zu Weihnachten in die Welt läuft. *Duncker u Humblot* haben gut honorirt und das Werk wird jetzt unter meinen Augen in Dessau gedruckt.

Schreiben Sie mir bald. Sie sind mir schuldig
‡ anonymen Brief aus Berlin, wozu ich hier einen Namen setze: W. Müller.

1 gedruckten Brief: ist wenigstens zwei geschriebene werth.

1 geschriebenen Brief.

Von Herzen der Ihrige

WILHELM MÜLLER.

All of the authors mentioned in the second paragraph (as well as Frau von Chézy herself) responded favorably, and are represented by contributions in the pages of *Askania*, although the success of Müller's persuasions did not prevent the early shipwreck of the project.

Frau von Chézy had co-operated with Baron von der Malsburg in translating various plays of Calderon.

The picture mentioned, a pencil-drawing by Wilhelm Hensel (who left a very large collection of portraits of celebrities of his time), is preserved—along with the rest of the collection—by the granddaughter of the artist, Frau Professor Friedrich Leo of Göttingen.

5. TO ACHIM VON ARNIM.

Dessau den 16^{ten} April 20.

Ew Hochwohlgeboren

Sage ich den verbindlichsten Dank für Ihren Beitrag zur *Askania*, den ich sogleich in das 4^{te} Heft aufgenommen habe. Möchte jede Aufnahme mir so viel Freude u Befriedigung verschaffen, als diese! Sie werden ein Exemplar aller Hefte der *Askania* erhalten und fortgehend jede Lieferung nach Erscheinung zugeschickt bekommen.

Sie haben früherhin kurze Beurtheilungen in den *Gesellschafter* geliefert. Jetzt finde ich Ihren Namen nicht mehr darin. Ich darf also wohl, ohne zu fürchten, dem *Gubitz* etwas zu rauben, Sie ersuchen, Beiträge solcher Art für die *Askania* zu schreiben, wenn Ihre Zeit es erlaubt. Überhaupt aber ersuche ich Sie nochmals dazu beizutragen, dass ich der Zeitschrift den Character zu geben vermöge, der sich, nur als Wunsch, in dem Vorworte (von W. v. Schütz) ausgesprochen hat. Bis jetzt läuft freilich noch Manches Schwache u Schiefe mit unter, aus Mangel an Besserem und noch mehr aus Verhältnissen der Freundschaft u Höflichkeit. Mit der Zeit hoffe ich Besseres u Unvermischteres zu geben. Freuen wird es mich, wenn Sie in meiner Redaktion wenigstens ein gutes Streben entdecken, und Ihr Gedicht auf den

seligen *Hermes*, dem ich auch Vieles verdanke, Ihnen nicht durch die Nachbarschaft entweiht erscheine.

Mit der aufrichtigsten Hochachtung

Ew Hochwohlgeboren

ergebenster Diener

W. MÜLLER.

Haben Sie nicht über die Mskrpte Ihres Schwagers Brentano zu disponiren? Ich sollte meinen, dass, wenn er in Berlin wäre, er mir seine Theilnahme nicht abschlagen würde.

N. B. Ich bin nicht *Professor*, sondern nur *Bibliothekar*. Diess um in einer kleinen Stadt kein Ärgerniss zu geben.

These statements do not seem to agree fully with Müller's letter to Karl Förster,¹ in which he declares, after the failure of the journal had become complete, that he gave almost nothing to Askania except his name upon the title-page. It is evident that he had hoped to parallel the great success of the leading literary and aesthetic journal of Berlin, Gubitz's *Gesellschafter, oder Blätter für Geist und Herz*, which appeared four times a week from 1817 to 1848, and which commanded the support of the whole group of the Berlin Romanticists, as well as such outsiders as Houwald and Wilhelm Müller, Goethe and Heine. Wilhelm von Schütz was one of the large number of nobly-born aspirants to literary distinction who make so characteristic a feature of the history of the later part of the Romantic movement. The subject of Arnim's memorial poem was Julius Gottfried Hermes, pastor of the Gertraudtenkirche (popularly known as the "Spitalkirche") in Berlin, born September 29, 1740, died December 30, 1818. His portrait is to be found in the Hensel collection, III, 33. Müller was a constant attendant upon his spiritual ministrations while studying in Berlin during 1815 and 1816.

Clemens Brentano, whom Müller came to know in March, 1816, had, along with Müller, been a member of the large band of unsuccessful suitors for the hand of the adorable Luise Hensel. The older and younger poet, as well as Wilhelm and Luise Hensel, Arnim, Frau von Chézy, Hedwig von Stägemann, Max Schenkendorf, Chamisso and Count von Loeben, had been closely associated in 1816 in producing the aesthetic annual, *Die Sängerehre*, edited by Friedrich Förster, and forming one of the most significant documents of the entire Romantic movement.

¹ Diary and Letters of Wilhelm Müller, Chicago, 1903. Page 96.

6. TO FRIEDRICH AUGUST WOLF.

Dessau, den 4^{ten} Juny 1820.

Hochgeehrtester Herr Geheimerath,

Die Versicherung Ihres freundlichen Andenkens, die ich vor einiger Zeit durch Herrn von Loen erhielt, hätte früher meinen erwiedernden Dank verdient. Das Buch, das Sie mit diesem Briefe empfangen, war die Ursache der Verzögerung. Ich wollte es Ihnen gern mit meinem Schreiben, als einen schwachen Beweis meiner Dankbarkeit übersenden. Das Interesse an der Stadt, die ich zu schildern versucht habe und die Nachsicht gegen einen Schüler wird Ihnen die Lektüre vielleicht erträglich machen.

Dass ich seit etwa 6 Monaten Bibliothekar geworden bin, wird Ihnen vielleicht schon bekannt sein; doch bin ich Ihnen die Anzeige schuldig. Der Direktor der Gelehrten-Schule, Stadelmann, ehemals Conrektor in Plauen im Voigtlande, ein Schüler Hermanns, war auch zum Bibliothekar berufen worden, trat aber bald ab, theils wegen zu vieler Arbeit, theils wegen Mangels an litterarischer Übersicht, da er sich ganz auf die beiden alten Sprachen und in ihnen auch wohl nur auf die Mechanischen Zweige der Philologie beschränkt. Die Schule scheint durch ihn nicht gewonnen zu haben: lateinisch und griechisch soll er gründlich, aber geschmacklos, lehren, im Vortrage der Geschichte aber, und überhaupt, wo er nicht Geistlosigkeit und Mangel an Urtheil mit lateinischen Phrasen zudecken kann, ist er unerträglich. Dazu fehlt es ihm gänzlich an Autorität. Meine Schulstunden sind jetzt weniger und angenehmer: ich lehre in Secunda der Gelehrten-Schule Griechisch u lateinisch: in diesem Halbjahre habe ich die Odyssee zu erklären angefangen und im Lateinischen lese ich den Sallust, Cicero de Senect. und Amicit. und Pompon. Mela, verbunden mit dem Vortrage über alte Geographie. Meine Schüler zeigen Eifer und Liebe zu meinem Unterricht u meiner Person und das macht mir die Arbeit leicht.

Die Bibliothek besitzt manche Schätze in alten Ausgaben. Auch Handschriften haben sich gefunden. Ausser den zwei von Jani gebrauchten Handschriften des Horaz eine dritte, so viel ich weiss, noch ganz unbekannte, von den Satiren und Episteln. Ferner ein Paar Mskr. des Ovid, eins des Lucan, des Statius. Der Herzog giebt jährlich 600 Rthlr. zur Anschaffung von Büchern und kauft ausserdem selbst noch manches kostbare Werk. Die Auswahl mache ich, ohne Beschränkung von einer Behörde, da ich in allen Bibliotheksangelegenheit[en] unmittelbar unter dem Herzog stehe und auch dem Kabinet meine Rechnungen vorlege.

Wie sehr freuen würde ich mich, wenn Sie, verehrtester Herr Geheimerath, diesen Sommer auf einer Badereise unser Dessau berührten! Zu Michael benutze ich vielleicht die Ferien zu

einer Reise nach Berlin und habe dort das Vergnügen, Sie zu sehen.

Hochachtungsvoll

Ihr

dankbarer Schüler

W. MÜLLER.

The book which the young poet herewith sends to his venerated teacher is the *Rom, Römer und Römerinnen* mentioned in Number 2.

The characteristically summary way in which Müller passes condemnation upon his predecessor as librarian is to be interpreted in the light of other categorical judgments which he pronounced in his days of immaturity, as upon Goethe, and notably upon Wolf himself.

Schnell fertig ist die Jugend mit dem Wort,
Das schwer sich handhabt, wie des Messers Schneide.

Christian Friedrich Stadelmann, director of the Ducal Gelehrten-schule in Dessau, was born in 1786, and contributed a number of solid and meritorious works in the fields of classical studies and pedagogy.

7. TO HELMINA VON CHÉZY.

Dessau, den 13^{ten} Juny 21.

Verehrte Freundin,

Dass ich Ihnen, Ihrem Verlangen gemäss, meinen Hochzeitstag nicht gemeldet habe, bedaure ich jetzt, da ich Ihren lieben Brief, unter vielen andern noch zu beantwortenden, wieder durchlese. Denn anstatt dass ich Ihnen heute ein Hochzeitgedicht schicke, hätte ich gewiss ein viel schöneres von Ihnen vor drei Wochen empfangen. Nun, es ist meine Schuld!

Von meinen Dresdner Freunden habe ich erst vor Kurzem erfahren, dass die enthusiastische Anzeige meiner Lieder von Ihnen herrühre. Was soll ich Ihnen zum Dank, zur Antwort sagen? Wenn etwas hier genügen kann, so sei es das, dass diese Anzeige mich noch 100 mal so sehr erfreut u erwärmt haben würde, wenn ich gewusst hätte, dass sie von Ihnen käme, obgleich die Beurtheilung eines unpartheiischen Fremdlings den Stolz des Dichters hätte in Anspruch nehmen müssen. Aber die Theilnahme meiner Freunde gilt mir mehr, als öffentliches Lob.

Ihre unangenehmen Verhältnisse mit Kalckreuth betrüben mich, besonders da ich zum Ausbruche der Zwistigkeiten unschuldigen Anlass gegeben habe. Jedoch verzweifle ich schriftlich bei Kalckreuth in dieser Sache wirken zu können. Wenigstens

hat er meine Anfragen u Vorschläge sehr decidirt verneint. Mündlich möchte sich ehr etwas thun lassen, vielleicht noch diesen Sommer, wo ich Dresden u meine dortigen Freunde mit meiner Frau zu begrüßen gedenke.

Meine Lieder sind bald vergriffen u ich denke Ihnen noch in diesem Jahre eine zweite Auflage zuzuschicken.

Ihr Freund

W. MÜLLER.

On May 21, 1821, had occurred Müller's marriage with Adelheid von Basedow, daughter of the Ducal Regierungsrath Ludwig von Basedow, and granddaughter of the celebrated pedagogic authority. He sends with the letter a copy of the verses he wrote for the occasion (Cf. Gedichte, 1868, I, 111), which was also the silver wedding of the bride's parents.

Sieben und siebenzig Gedichte aus den hinterlassenen Papieren eines reisenden Waldhornisten, Müller's first volume of collected poems, had appeared in Dessau in the autumn of 1820. It met with a fairly good sale.

Frau von Chézy's differences with the young poet, Count von Kalckreuth (son of the famous field-marshal, and a poetical associate of Müller's) are not recorded elsewhere, but they belong to a catalogue so long that it would be a thankless task to extend it.

8. TO F. A. BROCKHAUS.

Dessau den 26^{ten} Februar 1823.

Ihre Materialiensendung, verehrter und geliebter Freund, habe ich erhalten und werde ich nach besten Kräften benutzen. Die ersten Arbeiten sende ich gleich hierbei ein:

Ueber Moore's Loves of the Angels

3 Nummern litt. Bemerk., die hoffentlich den alten Beck nicht kopscheu machen werden.

Auch erhalten Sie Ihrem Wunsche gemäss zurück

die ersten drei schon benutzten Hefte der Lit. Gaz.

Nouv. Messéniennes.

Das Trauerspiel des jungen Grosse habe ich gelesen, mit Neugier und Aufmerksamkeit. Der Dichter dauert mich, denn es wird ihm viel schaden. Es tritt mit *gewaltigen* Ansprüchen auf, u leistet, wenn wir das Ganze ins Auge fassen, sehr wenig. Einzelne Blitze kräftigen Genies besonders in den prosaischen, populären Szenen: übrigens durchaus keine dramatische Sprache u kein dramatischer Geist. Ueberall blickt die Nachahmung zweier Unnachahmlicher, Göthes u Shakespeare's durch, aber

freilich ist Alles was nachgeahmt wird, überboten u überspannt. Wäre Grosse seinen eigenen Weg bescheiden gegangen, er hätte etwas geleistet, denn eine *poetische Natur* ist er gewiss.

Ich hielt es für meine Pflicht, Ihnen diese meine allgemeine Ansicht vorher mitzutheilen, da es scheint dass Sie Interesse für das Stück haben. Wünschen Sie also eine lobende Rezension—der Wunsch ist *jedem* erlaubt—so übergeben Sie das Stück einem Andern. Ich kann wenig daran loben, aber ich würde mit Nachsicht u selbst aufmunternd tadeln.

Wekherlin wird diese Woche fertig. *Fritzsche* hat zum zweiten Male den Schwabenstreich gemacht, keine Bogen für mich zurückzubehalten. Ich muss Sie also wieder um die Uebersendung von 50 Ex. bitten, wenn das Ganze in Ihren Händen ist.

Dass vor der Michaelismesse kein neuer Band kommen soll, ist mir sehr erwünscht; So bleibt mir für diesen Sommer Raum zu anderen Arbeiten, die ich schon lange habe vornehmen wollen.

Ich habe die Hoffnung bald recht viel Musse zu gewinnen, da ich meine Stunden in der hiesigen Gelehrten-Schule los zu werden denke. Alsdann will ich thätiger für Ihre Institute sein.

? *Wann* müssen Sie spätestens den Aufsatz über Tasso haben, wenn er in das *nächste* Heft des *Hermes* (? ?) kommen soll? Ich bin fast zu Ende damit.

Nun zu etwas Anderem u Wichtigerem.

Ich habe Ihnen, glaube ich, schon vor einem Jahre, als ich bei Ihnen war, gesagt, dass ich damit umginge eine Sammlung meiner Gedichte zu veranstalten. Die 77 Waldhornistenlieder sind Kommissionsartikel u mein Eigenthum u da sie bis auf wenige Ex. (circa 50) vergriffen sind, so will ich diese an mich nehmen: denn solche Restanten besonders, wenn es Kommissionsartikel sind, kommen selten aus dem Laden.

Natürlich denke ich bei dieser neuen Unternehmung zuerst an Sie, da ich überhaupt wünsche, Alles, was ich als Schriftsteller besitze, in Ihren Verlag zu bringen. Die neue Sammlung würde aus circa 60 Bogen gedruckt bestehen, wobei ich etwa Rückerts Rosen als Norm der Lettern, Spatia u des Formats annehme. Das gäbe 2 mächtige Theile, wovon der erste in diesem Jahre (womöglich noch im Sommer) erscheinen sollte, der andere zur Ostermesse 1824.

Ausser dem, was Ihnen von meinen Gedichten bekannt ist (also die 77 mit ihren Ergänzungen, die Griechenlieder) würde diese Sammlung eine Anzahl Gesellschaftslieder (zum Theil politische Chansons aber ohne Censuranstoss) Epigramme, erotische Spiele, Satyren etc. enthalten. Die Griechenlieder, deren erste beiden Hefte Sie oder ich von Ackermann entnehme, würden zum zweiten Theil geschlagen werden u könnten einzeln auch verkauft werden. Bis 1824 sind sie sicherlich in den ersten Auflagen vergriffen und wegen der zwey Hefte die Sie nur als zweite Auflage zu honoriren brauchen, treffen wir dann eine besondere Abmachung, ohne jetzt darüber das *Ganze* zu stören. Ich weiss,

dass Gedichte eine schlechte Buchhändlerwaare sind u ohne etwas über den wirklichen poetischen Werth der meinigen selbstlobend beizubringen, beschränke ich mich auf das, was ich von ihrem merkantilischen Werthe sagen kann. Diess ist:

Die 77 sind zu einer Zeit, wo ich so gut als ohne Namen in der deutschen Litteratur war, als Kommissionsartikel, in einer Handlung die den Vertrieb schlecht versteht u wenig ausgebreitete Verbindung hat, erschienen und doch in ca. zwei Jahren so gut wie vergriffen worden. Die Auflage war 500 Ex. wovon ich wohl über 50 selbst verschenkt habe. Nehmen wir also 400 verkaufte.

Wie die Griechenlieder sich verkaufen, können Sie jetzt selbst beurtheilen. Ich weiss es nur von den ersten beiden Heften.

Nun ist wohl einzusehen, dass das politische Interesse hier einwirkt, und dieses Interesse hat doch das Gute für die ganze Sammlung, dass es meinen Namen mit weit verbreitet hat.

Soviel zu Gunsten meiner Gedichte Sie wissen, dass ich es nicht übel nehme, wenn Sie mir zeigen dass ich mich in den Voraussetzungen irre, die ich aus diesen Umständen für den Verkauf der grösseren Sammlung mache, und wissen auch dass ich fern bin, bei einer solchen Sache Anspruch auf die freundschaftlichen Verhältnisse zu machen, in denen ich die Ehre habe mit Ihnen zu stehen. Wir dürfen und wollen hier bloss als ein Paar Kaufleute agiren, die sich nicht persönlich kennen.

Ich frage also:

Haben Sie Lust zu der Unternehmung? und

Was ist Ihnen mein Name werth?

Ich schlage mehrere Bedingungen vor,

1) Sie machen zuerst eine kleine Auflage von 500 bis 600 Ex. und bestimmen danach das Honorar, so, dass ich bei der zweiten Auflage von eben so viel Exempl. die Hälfte des ersten Honorars erhalte u so fort bei *jeder Auflage*.

2) Sie machen gleich *eine* sehr grosse Auflage, so viel Ex. Sie wollen u können u behalten den Verlag auf eine bestimmte Anzahl Jahre, nach deren Ablaufe die Gedichte mir wieder zu fallen, jedoch so, dass Sie das Verkaufsrecht behalten.

3) Sie kaufen mir die Waare ein für allemal u für immer ab, u können dann damit machen, was Sie wollen—versteht sich, ohne daran etwas zu aendern.

Natürlich würde ich in diesem letzten Falle meine Bedingungen *hoch* stellen müssen, da ich die Waare für das Beste halte was ich besitze. *Omnia mea mecum porto.*

Diese drei Vorschläge sind aus meinem Kopfe entsprungen u da wir Poeten schlechte Geschäftskenner sind, so ist es leicht möglich, dass keiner davon recht praktisch ist. Dafür habe ich denn auch die pekuniären Bedingungen nicht bestimmt. Es wird mir am liebsten sein, wenn Sie sich erst für einen *dieser* Vorschläge oder eine von Ihnen zu bestimmende Art des Contrakts entscheiden. Alsdann will ich meine pekuniären Bedingungen hinzufügen, oder überlasse es auch Ihnen, zu sagen, was Sie geben wollen oder können.

Nur in einer Hinsicht nehme ich Ihre Freundschaft in Anspruch, nemlich, dass Sie sich bald entscheiden. Ich habe nemlich Ursach zu wünschen, dass der erste Theil der Sammlung wenigstens in diesem Jahre, am liebsten noch in diesem Sommer erscheine. Als Norm der Bogenbestimmung wollen Sie Rückerts Rosen wählen.

Schreiben Sie mir ja keinen so langen Brief wie ich Ihnen. Ich würde mir ein Gewissen daraus machen, Ihnen dazu Veranlassung gegeben zu haben, da Sie noch nicht ganz wieder Herr Ihrer Thätigkeit sind.

Mit unveränderlichen Gesinnungen der Freundschaft
Ihr

treu ergebener
W. MÜLLER.

The copy of this letter kindly furnished by its owner contains no address, but it is evidently directed to the eminent Leipzig publisher, for whom Müller began the publication of the *Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* in 1822 (See Number 14). The fourth volume, containing Weckherlin, appeared in 1823.

The reviews and notices which Müller sends are probably for the *Litterarisches Konversationsblatt* which Brockhaus founded in 1820. The essay on Moore's *Loves of the Angels* is reprinted in Müller's *Vermischte Schriften*, 1830, V, 236 ff.

"Der alte Beck" seems to refer to Professor Christian Daniel Beck (1757-1832), philologist and historian of literature in Leipzig, who edited at this time the *Allgemeines Repertorium der neuesten in- und ausländischen Litteratur*.

"Das Trauerspiel" is Ernst Grosse's (born 1803) tragedy, *Graf Gordo*, 1822. It was printed by the publisher Hahn in Hanover, in order to furnish the young man with his first means for beginning a university education. Hahn's attention had been arrested by a note annexed by Adolf Müllner to certain of Grosse's poems in the *Morgenblatt*, in which it was stated that the young author, who had high aspirations toward literature and art, had no means of prosecuting his studies.

Hermes, oder kritisches Jahrbuch der Litteratur, began to be published by Brockhaus in 1819.

For some reason Brockhaus seems not to have been attracted by any of the various plans proposed by the poet, for the next volume of Müller's poems, like the "77 Lieder", was printed by Ackermann in Dessau. Perhaps the matter was broken off by

the death of Brockhaus, which occurred on August 20 of the year of this letter. The Leipzig firm subsequently published Müller's *Homerische Vorschule* in 1824, and his collected works after his death.

9. TO VARNHAGEN VON ENSE.

Dessau, den 22^{ten} Juni 24.

Ew Hochwohlgeboren

geehrtes vom 8^{ten} Dieses ist mir ein sehr angenehmes Pfand Ihrer gütigen Erinnerung an meinen, leider für mich so flüchtigen Besuch bei Ihnen, und ich eile dasselbe unter mehreren Briefen, die ich bei meiner Rückkehr aus Dresden vorfinde, zuerst zu beantworten.

In Dessau finden sich allerdings noch manche mündliche Traditionen von dem alten *Schnurrbart*, (so nennt ihn das Volk) aber freilich kann ich für die Reinheit derselben nicht haften. Ich werde Ihnen, was sich aufreiben lässt, sammeln. Handschriftliches habe ich nichts in der Bibliothek, was Ihnen zu Ihrem Plane dienlich sein könnte. Was im Archive ist, hat *Beckmann* benutzt, nach ihm *Lenz*; und *Bertram* nebst seinem Fortsetzer *Krause* haben Sie wohl auch in Händen. Einige von *Leopold* benutzte Pläne, Dispositionen u dergleichen militärischen Apparat haben wir in der Bibliothek, doch werden Sie wohl nicht so pünktlich in dem Militärischen der Biographie sein, dass dies Sie interessiren könnte. Auch ist's wohl an u für sich unwichtig. Was die fatale Begebenheit in der Liebschaft betrifft, so finden Sie darüber Aufschluss in der von *Samuel Baur* gegebenen Biographie *Leopolds*. (Interessante Lebensgemälde. 7^{ter} B. S. 96). Überhaupt giebt Ihnen diese flüchtige Arbeit eines Vielschreibers doch vielleicht einige Notizen. Anekdoten von *Leopold* sind, so viel ich weiss, in keiner eigenen Sammlung gedruckt. Aber es circuliren viele in Dessau u ich hoffe Ihnen bald einige mittheilen zu können. Kennen Sie z. B. die Geschichte des Dessauer Marsches? Eine bedeutende Anzahl solcher Anekdoten findet sich in dem ersten oder zweiten Jahrgange des *Morgenblatts*, wenn ich nicht irre, von *Spieker* in *Frankfurt a. d. Oder* mitgetheilt, welcher damals in *Dessau* lebte. Es wird Ihnen nicht schwer werden, diese aufzusuchen.

So viel für heute. Die Resultate meiner Anekdotenjagd können Sie erst in circa 4 Wochen erwarten, da ich Ende dieser Woche wieder verreise, nach *Quedlinburg* zu *Klopstocks* Säcularfeier, wobei ich denn den Harz ein wenig durchstreifen werde. Ich bin so aufrichtig gewesen, Ihnen zu erkennen zu geben, dass in den Dessauer Archiven nichts für Sie zu finden sei. Das ist mir schwer geworden, u ich hätte mich beinahe von meinem Wunsche, Sie hier zu sehn, verleiten lassen, Ihnen reiche Ausbeute hier zu verheissen. Ich danke für die Nachricht über *Wolfs* Wohlsein. Ich erhalte in diesen Tagen meine *Homer-*

ische Vorschule vom Verleger. Könnten Sie mir nicht mit Rath u That behülflich sein, *Wolfen* ein Exemplar davon auf sicherm Wege zukommen zu lassen?

Den Lord *Byron* habe ich im Grablied gesungen, das Sie nächstens lesen werden. Vielleicht finden Sie darin einen leisen Nachklang von dem mir mitgetheilten Gedanken *Chamisso's*.

Empfangen Sie die Versicherung meiner aufrichtigsten Ergebenheit, mit der ich die Ehre habe mich zu nennen

Ew Hochwohlgeboren
gehorsamster

W. MÜLLER.

In May and June, 1824, Müller had spent weeks of unmixed delight and refreshment at the Villa Grassi near Dresden, the summer residence of his friend, Count von Kalckreuth (cf. Number 7). The above letter, written soon after his return, was in response to Varnhagen's request to Müller, as court librarian, for materials for a biographical sketch of Prince Leopold of Anhalt-Dessau, which appeared in the second volume of his *Biographische Denkmale*, 1825. Prominent among his sources the author mentions "Handschriftliche Mittheilungen von Herrn Hofrath und Bibliothekar Wilhelm Müller in Dessau."

Klopstock's hundredth birthday was celebrated with much ceremony at Quedlinburg in the first days of July, 1824; Carl Maria von Weber directed the musical part of the festivities, and Wilhelm Müller's gifted wife sang the alto solos in the chief compositions rendered.

The *Homerische Vorschule* (Leipzig, 1824; second edition, with introduction and notes by Baumgarten-Crusius, 1836), shows Müller as a devoted pupil of Wolf; he attempts, in a fresh and independent way, to make the ideas of his teacher known to a larger circle of readers.

The poem *Byron* appeared as a supplement to the second edition of the *Lieder der Griechen*, 1825. See *Gedichte*, 1868, II, 123.

10. TO VARNHAGEN VON ENSE.

Dessau, den 14^{ten} September 24.

Ew Hochwohlgeboren

übersende ich anbei einige Früchte meiner Nachsuchungen für Ihre Biographie unsres Fürsten Leopold.

Die Memoiren haben sich im hiesigen Hausarchiv unter dem Nachlasse des Fürsten Leopold Maximilian gefunden, auf dessen Befehl sie also wohl, bald nach Leopolds Tode (im Jahre 1751,

wie der Titel besagt) aufgesetzt worden sind. Über den Verfasser derselben habe ich keine Muthmassung, jedoch sind sie gewiss nach den sichersten Quellen u mit Benutzung aller Urkunden gearbeitet. Wenn Sie selbst Zeit hätten, einige Wochen hier zu sein, so würde Ihnen das Hausarchiv, dessen Benutzung keine Schwierigkeit findet, eine *grosse, sehr grosse* Menge von Briefen, Berichten, Verordnungen, pp Leopolds liefern, grösstentheils eigenhändige Dokumente. Aber ich wüsste in der That nicht, wo anfangen, da ich nicht weiss, wo es Ihnen fehlt u wo etwas Neues zu finden ist.

Die Memoiren hat Se. Durchlaucht der Herzog für Sie kopiren lassen u sendet sie Ihnen durch mich zur beliebigen Benutzung. Wenn Sie sie nicht mehr brauchen, schicken Sie mir das Manuskript zurück. Vielleicht richten Sie ein Paar Zeilen des Dankes gelegentlich an den Herzog, dem es vielleicht Freude machen würde, Sie auf diese Weise kennen zu lernen.

Ich selbst schicke Ihnen einige Notizen u werde wohl gelegentlich mehr nachfolgen lassen.

Die Nachricht von dem Tode unsres Freundes Wolf hat mich tief erschüttert. Ich kann mir den Lebensvollen gar nicht todt denken. Ihre Worte zu seinem Andenken bei Göthe's Geburtstage haben mich herzlich angesprochen, u ich möchte Ihnen die Hand dafür drücken. Denkt denn noch Niemand an eine Biographie des grossen Mannes? Ich dünkte Sie wären der Mann dazu.

Mich beschäftigt jetzt eine deutsche Übersetzung der Neugriechischen Volkslieder, welche Fauriel gesammelt hat, u zwar so sehr, dass ich Ihnen heute diesen sehr flüchtigen Brief schreiben muss. Entschuldigen Sie das u sein Sie versichert der hochachtungsvollen Gesinnungen

Ihres

ergebensten Dieners

W. MÜLLER.

This letter is without an address, but is evidently a continuation of the preceding correspondence with Varnhagen.

Friedrich August Wolf had died at Marseilles on August 8, 1824. Müller's reverence and piety toward the memory of his great master in the classics found admirable expression in his *Einige Worte über Friedrich August Wolf, 1825* (reprinted in the *Vermischte Schriften*, IV, 163 ff.), in which he calls him the "greatest philologist of our fatherland, one of the greatest men of the century". The study is particularly valuable because of the vivid and happy characterization from one who had viewed its subject from near at hand. Müller emphasizes the vital element, the "living word" in Wolf's personality, whereby he

was able to revive antiquity, and became himself, for the time, a Grecian or Roman. He is pictured as being a man of the world, able to associate with practical men in other fields of activity, and as being totally free from bondage to the dead letter of his science. His attractive personality and the charm of his social nature are also touched upon.

Wolf's objectivity in estimating his own achievements, as well as those of others, had not tallied with Müller's ready-made canons in his student days, but appeared to him "conceit and envy", and we read in his boyish diary of November 26, 1815:

Sonst sprach er fast nur von sich und seinem Ruhme: Alles andere wurde zu Boden getreten: Böckh, Buttmann, Schleiermacher pp. Ich hätte ihm immer zurufen mögen: O du Alleszermalmer! (Diary and Letters, p. 51).

In the period of his maturity, Müller confesses that Wolf's critical faculty, his Socratic irony, were usually misunderstood as *malice d'esprit*, but that their possessor was always more ready to turn these engines upon his own services and claims than upon those of any of his contemporaries.

The translation of Modern Greek Volkslieder appeared (with accompanying Greek text and Fauriel's notes) in 1825. Bernhard Klein set a number of them to music.

II. TO FRIEDRICH VON RAUMER.

[Dessau 20 Okt. 24]¹

Hochverehrter Herr,

Die Aufmerksamkeit und Theilnahme, welche Sie meinem Buche über die Homerischen Gedichte schenken, ehrt u erfreut mich sehr, und die Bemerkungen u Einwürfe, welche Sie mir über einzelne Ansichten, die ich dort dargelegt habe, machen, ist mir der liebste Beweis des Beifalls, den Sie dem Buche im Allgemeinen geben.

Erlauben Sie mir also, als Dank für Ihre Mittheilung vom 9^{ten} Oktober hier sogleich Einiges als Beantwortung Ihrer Zweifel u Bedenklichkeiten über den vielköpfigen Homer zu sagen. Nehmen Sie es als eine Konversation, die ich mündlich lieber machen würde, wenn ich jetzt das Vergnügen hätte, bei Ihnen zu sein. Mündlich hat so etwas weniger anmassliches Ansehn. Dem Schreiber muss man den Lehrton schon vergeben, auch wenn er an Jemand schreibt, von dem er nur lernen kann.

Die Einheit der homerischen Poesie in dem Geiste und der

¹ Added by another hand in pencil.

Form des Ganzen, und wenn wir über Einzelnes hinwegsehn, was spätere Einfüger hinzugethan haben, erkenne ich mit Ihnen an. Aber ich trenne diese *innere Einheit* bestimmt von dem *äussern Zusammenhange* eines grossen Gedichts. Die Gründe, warum dieser äussere Zusammenhang in der Ilias u Odyssee nicht ist u nicht sein kann, glaube ich ziemlich erschöpfend in dem Buche selbst vorgetragen zu haben. Die *innere Einheit* aber bringt den Totalindruck hervor, freilich auch mit Hülfe der durch Vorurtheile, die wir aus unserm Knabenalter mitbringen, bestätigten Einheit oder Vereinigung der später aufgedrungenen Form der Epopöe. Aber ohne die *innere Einheit* hätte der *gemachte* Zusammenhang niemals als ein *ursprünglicher* u *natürlicher* erscheinen können. Wollen wir auch bei den einzelnen Gesängen Zusammenhang suchen, so gebe ich ihn in so weit zu, dass z. B. der Sänger der Irrfahrtenerzählung des Odysseus bei den Phäaken allerdings wohl daran dachte, sich an die *Gesänge von den Reisen des Telemach* erzählend anzuschliessen, oder umgekehrt. Aber ein solches erzählendes, episches Anschliessen ist kein *formeller* Zusammenhang einer Epopöe.

An ein ursprüngliches zusammenhängendes Episches Ganzes der Ilias u Odyssee kann ich also durchaus nicht glauben, ja, ich kann es mir nicht einmal vorstellen. *Einen* Dichter als Verfasser der beiden Gedichte oder auch nur eines derselben anzunehmen, erlauben die inneren u äusseren Widersprüche in denselben nicht. Aber einen *Homer* sich als Vereiniger oder Diaskeuasten in der Zeit des Gesanges selbst zu denken, der also Fremdes u Eigenes zu zwei grossen Ganzen zusammengeschmolzen hätte, widerspricht eben so sehr jenem naturschöpferischen Zeitalter, wie auch der Natur des grossen Schöpfers. Für die *kleinen Leute*, um mich Ihres Ausdrucks zu bedienen, ist ein solches Nacharbeiten u Nachhelfen recht eigentlich eine passende Arbeit.

Ich habe von *innern* u *äussern* Widersprüchen in den beiden Gedichten geredet. Mein Buch handelt aber fast nur von den äussern, ich meine denen, die im Stoffe liegen (Personenverwechslung, Zeitwirrwar pp). Die *innern* habe ich nur angedeutet, und nur in so weit sie die poetische Behandlung angehn, etwas näher ausgeführt. Es fehlt der Abschnitt, welcher aus der *Sprache* der Ilias u Odyssee diese Verschiedenheit der Sänger u Gesänge darthun sollte. Diese Lücke ist theils absichtlich, indem diese Untersuchung vor ein anderes Publikum gehört, als die übrigen Abhandlungen, theils bin ich auch mit dieser sehr weitläufigen u schwierigen Sache selbst noch nicht fertig, um damit aufzutreten, wohl aber so weit fertig, um die Resultate derselben darlegen zu können.

Die grosse Menge von Versen u Stellen, welche die Alexandriner als unhomerisch verworfen haben—gleichsam den Homer aus dem Homer herauswerfend,—ist ein guter Vorgang für diese Untersuchung. Die meisten dieser Auswürfe lassen sich halten, wenn man verschiedene Sänger u Gesänge der beiden grossen

Conglobationen annimmt, sonst nicht. Denn, wenn diese auch alle, als aus einer Schule, etwas Gemeinschaftliches und Gleichförmiges in der Weise u Sprache hätten, so kann das Individuum, als solches, sich doch in seinem Schaffen nie ganz verleugnen. In sprachlicher Hinsicht hatten aber die Alexandrianer eine sehr scharfe Nase. Endlich ist durch Spohns Untersuchung über den Schluss der Odyssee auch die grammatische und sprachliche Unmöglichkeit überhaupt mit der grössten Evidenz dargethan worden, dass dieses Schlusstück nicht aus dem Munde u aus dem Zeitalter des Sängers der übrigen Theile der Odyssee herühren kann. Dass die *Doloneia* nicht zur Ilias gehört, behauptet fast das ganze gelehrte Alterthum. Wie viel werden wir also ohne alle Rettung aus dem Homer herauswerfen müssen—*bloss der Sprache wegen*—wenn wir *einen* Homer als Verfasser derselben annehmen! Und was für eine Einheit der Form des Zusammenhanges kann das sein, die solche Herauswerfungen erträgt u doch Einheit bleibt?

Aber das ist bei Weitem nicht Alles. Wir haben unsre homerische Sprache, Phraseologie, Formenwesen pp auf der Schule als ein geschlossenes Ganzes kennen gelernt, und es giebt dafür eigene Lexica, Grammatiken pp. Aber ist denn das Ding auch so geschlossen? Wenn wir nur einen Schüler, der im Griechischen etwas mehr Fortschritte gemacht hat, als man gewöhnlich zur Lesung des Homers erfordert, zu der Ilias bringen u das Gedicht schnell u in Zusammenhang mit ihm durchgehn, so wird er, bei der Gleichförmigkeit der Sprache u Poesie, nach fleissigem Durchlesen u Durchpräpariren u Repetiren der ersten beiden Gesänge, in der Folge mit Leichtigkeit u ohne viel nachschlagen zu dürfen, eine lange Reihe der Gesänge weg lesen. Aber dann kommen Absätze, da hapert's. Da kömmt ein Gesang, in dem er sich fast so fremd fühlt, wie bei dem Anfang der Lektüre im ersten Gesange: neue Wörter, Formen, Wendungen, Verbindungen pp. Dieser Eindruck ist bei uns schwächer, die wir den Homer langsam u mit Zwischenräumen erst auf der Schule, dann auf der Universität durchgenommen haben. Dennoch fühlt ein jeder diese Anstösse, wenn er die Ilias von Anfang bis zu Ende ohne Pausen durchliest—etwa in einigen Wochen, oder, wenn's geht, in einer. Wolf hat mir diese Methode einmal empfohlen, und ich verdanke diesem Versuch viel. Wolf hatte mir die Punkte, wo die neuen Anstösse anfangen, nicht gesagt, und ich notirte mir beim Lesen meine Erfahrungen, und sie trafen fast überall mit Wolf zusammen. Das *konnte* keine Täuschung sein.

An die Sprache schliesst sich die epische Weise an, besonders in den oft vorkommenden Refräs. Welchen Grund sollen wir z. B. annehmen, warum ein u derselbe Sänger in einem u demselben Gedicht erst sechs acht oder zehn Gesänge lang die Refräs: *er sprach, er ass u trank, die Sonne ging auf, unter,*

sie versammelten sich pp unverändert mit einem u demselben Verse in epischer umständlicher Weise ausdrückt, und dann einmal drei oder vier Gesänge lang keinen von diesen Versen gebraucht, sondern dasselbe durch eine andre epische Umschreibung ausdrückt? Das ist doch kein Suchen nach Manigfaltigkeit im Sinne der Neuern?

Sie sehn also, dass mein Buch noch manches nachzutragen u weiter auszuführen übrig lässt. Wann ich aber dazu kommen werde, kann ich nicht bestimmen; das hängt von meiner Musse ab, die, wie Sie wissen, theils durch das Schulmeistern, theils durch die Schriftstellerei, die schnell arbeitet u schnell bezahlt wird, sehr bedrängt ist. Eine solche Untersuchung will ausschliessliche Beschränkung auf den *einen* Gegenstand. Ausserdem fehlt auch noch die Nachweisung, was die homerische Sage für einen Gang zu den asiatischen Ionern genommen hat. Über diesen letzten Gegenstand so wie über manches Verwandte finden Sie—wenn es Sie interessirt—einen Aufsatz von mir in einem der letzten Hefte der Hallischen Literaturzeitung—vielleicht ist's noch nicht einmal da—bei Gelegenheit einer Rezension zweier Broschüren von Bernhard Thiersch (dem Bruder des Münchener).

Doch ich sehe, mein Bogen ist zu Ende und kaum noch Platz zu einer anständigen Unterschrift. Ihre freundliche Erinnerung an unser Zusammensein in meinem Hause, wird von mir u meiner Frau dankbar erkannt. Wir beide hoffen noch diesen Winter Berlin und Sie zu sehn. Empfehlen Sie mich Ihrer Frau Gemahlin, der ich mit Hochachtung u Verehrung mich nenne

Ihren

ergebensten Diener

W. MÜLLER.

An exposition of Wolf's Homeric theory, as expounded in Müller's *Homerische Vorschule* (see Number 9).

Friedrich von Raumer, the historian, was, like Müller, a native of Anhalt, having been born at Wörlitz on May 14, 1781. In 1819 he had been called from Breslau to the chair of political economy and history at the University of Berlin; in 1822 he was chosen Rector. The new, ruthless school of criticism which had come into vogue with Wolf and Niebuhr was never sympathetic to his conciliatory and humane spirit, and it is perhaps on this account that he never gathered a "school" of younger men about him. He died June 14, 1873.

12. TO VARNHAGEN VON ENSE.

Dessau, den 4^{ten} Januar 1825.

Verehrtester Herr,

Ihrem Wunsche in Hinsicht des Dessauer Marsches kann ich mit folgender Notiz, die ich aus unsres Herzogs eigenem Munde habe, genügen:

Fürst Leopold erhielt den berühmten Marsch nach der gewonnenen Schlacht bei Cassano von den dortigen Landseinwohnern dedicirt, wahrscheinlich von den Einwohnern von Cassano selbst. Bei einer Parade-Feierlichkeit, die zu Ehren dieses Sieges gehalten wurde, spielte man den Marsch zuerst, der sowohl dem Fürsten als den Truppen sehr gefiel, dass er seit der Zeit Lieblingsmarsch u mit passenden Worten zu Ehren des Fürsten Leopold begleitet wurde.

Ich freue mich, dass die Memoiren Ihnen einige Dienste geleistet haben, u sehe, nicht bloss als Anhaltiner, mit gespannter Theilnahme der Erscheinung des 2^{ten} Theiles Ihrer Biogr. Denkm. entgegen.

Ad vocem Biogr. fällt mir ein, dass der Herausgeber des Neuen Nekrologs der Deutschen (Superintendent Schmidt in Ilmenau) mich seit lange um eine Biographie Wolfs angeht. Wie gern ich die liefern möchte, wenn ich nur einiger Massen im Stande wäre, etwas Würdiges zu leisten, brauche ich Sie wohl nicht zu versichern. Aber eine armselige Kompilation kann ich u will ich nicht geben. Bei *Körte* ist nun wohl auch nichts zu erhalten, da er selbst an eine Biographie denkt. Haben Sie vielleicht etwas von Notizen über das Geschichtliche von Wolf's Leben? Oder könnten Sie das Institut dieses Nekrologs vielleicht selbst mit einer kurzen Biographie des Verewigten beglücken? In bessere Hände, als in die Ihrigen, könnte die Arbeit nicht kommen.

Meine Neugriechischen Volkslieder sind bald fertig gedruckt (bei Voss in Leipzig); u auch meine Biogr. *Byron's* erscheint wohl in einigen Wochen.

Unsre Reise nach Berlin ist allerdings nur aufgeschoben, nicht aufgehoben, aber der abgesagte Karneval berührt uns nicht, da wir doch wohl erst gegen Ostern kommen.

Ihre schönen Hoffnungen für etwas, das von Seiten der Könige u Fürsten von der Sanktität zum Besten der Griechen geschehen möchte, kann ich nicht theilen. *Selbst!*—oder niemals. Das bleibt mein Wahlspruch. Sollte der grossartige Kampf der Christenheit u Menschheit gegen das Heidenthum u die Barbarei in eine Kabinettsverhandlung endigen?

Empfehlen Sie mich dem geneigten Andenken Ihrer Frau Gemahlin und empfangen Sie die Versicherung der hochachtungsvollen Ergebenheit, mit der ich bin

Ihr

gehorsamster

W. MÜLLER.

Without address: a continuation of Numbers 9 and 10.

The battle of Cassano (August 16, 1705) between Vendôme and Prince Eugene was the fiercest combat on Italian soil during the War of the Spanish Succession. Leopold, who led the

Prussians, encouraged his troops to deeds of desperate valor which are still the boast of the Prussian army.

Dr. Körte, of Halberstadt, Wolf's son-in-law, published the latter's *Life and Studies* in two volumes, 1833.

The *Life of Byron* appeared in *Zeitgenossen*, Leipzig, 1825, Heft 41 (reprinted in *Vermischte Schriften*, III, 277).

13. TO ADOLF MÜLLNER.

Dessau, den 17. Jan. 1826.

Ew. Wohlgeboren

wollen den langen Aufschub meiner Antwort auf Ihre mir sehr ehrenvolle Einladung zur Theilnahme an dem Mitternachtsblatte ja nicht als eine Geringsachtung jener Einladung deuten. Ich hätte Ihnen früher einen Entschuldigungsbrief mit ungewissen Versprechungen schicken müssen, und so denke ich, wenn ich heute wenigstens etwas, wenn auch unbedeutende Kleinigkeiten, bringe, Ihnen dadurch meinen guten Willen besser zu bekunden, als durch eine umgehende Antwort ohne Beilage geschehen sein würde. Aufrichtig, Ihre Einladung ist mir nicht allein als solche, zu einem tüchtigen und gewiss zu schönem Gedeihen bestimmten Unternehmen, erfreulich, sondern ganz vorzüglich als ein Beweis, dass die unseligen Missverständnisse, in denen wir eine Zeit lang gestanden haben, Ihnen ebenso so sehr in Vergessenheit gekommen sind, wie mir. Ich bleibe Ihrem freundlichen Entgegenkommen nicht zurück, und versichere Sie, dass bei mir keine *Arriere pensée* aus Studentenzeiten statt findet.

Wenn die kleinen Gedichte Ihrem Blatte zusagen, so lasse ich gelegentlich wohl mehr folgen. Eine wesentliche und regelmässige Theilnahme kann ich Ihrem Journal aber leider jetzt nicht zusagen, da die Uebernahme eines Theils der Redaktion der grossen Gleditschischen Encyclopädie fast alle meine Mussestunden in Beschlag nimmt, wenigstens für die erste Zeit, ehe ich mich in das neue Geschäft gefunden habe.

Die Honorarbestimmung überlasse ich Ihnen. Bei den Kleinigkeiten, die ich liefere, ist der Punkt nicht von Bedeutung. Eine Mittelzahl meines Journalhonorars ist 3 Louisdor.

Empfangen Sie die Versicherung meiner aufrichtigen Hochachtung, mit der ich die Ehre habe, mich zu nennen

Ew. Wohlgeboren

ergebensten Diener

W. MÜLLER.

Wilhelm Müller had had a youthful admiration for the author of *Die Schuld*, but as early as 1817 came into a long-drawn-out controversy with Müllner in the *Gesellschafter*, on the subject of the theater and opera in Berlin. The dispute dragged its

weary length through the unedifying phases of "Einige Bemerkungen," "Genugthuung für die Oper," "Genugthuung für Herrn Hofrath Müllner," "Nothwendige Erklärungen," "Antworten," and "Verzicht."

Müllner's Mitternachtblatt für gebildete Stände, edited by him from 1826 until his death in 1829, was published in Brunswick.

At the beginning of 1826 Müller joined with Professor G. Hassel, of Weimar, in taking up the editing of Ersch and Gruber's enormous Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste, published at Leipzig by Johann Friedrich Gleditsch. They undertook the section H—N (see the following letter). Müller's signed contributions are chiefly upon classical and old-Germanic subjects and personages in English literature. The second part of this section (1828) still bears Müller's name, and a number of articles by him. His contributions are also found in the third part (1828). The fifth part (1829) has as frontispiece a large engraving of the deceased poet.

14. TO K. H. G. VON MEUSEBACH.

Dessau, den 22^{ten} Jan. 1826.

Verehrtester Herr Geheimerath,

Indem ich Ihnen den 8^{ten} Band meiner Bibl. d. D. übergebe, bringe ich Ihnen nur im Auszuge zurück, was Sie mir massenweise aus Ihrer reichen Sammlung zur Benutzung überlassen haben. Was ich in der Vorrede dieses Bandes *bekenne*, ist kein Kompliment für Sie, sondern ein aufrichtiges *Bekennniss*.

Ich nehme Ihre Güte für den 9^{ten} Band wieder in Anspruch u bitte Sie für mich bei Seite zu legen (durch die erste sichere Gelegenheit lasse ich das Päckchen in Empfang nehmen):

1) Die Sammlungen der *Pegnesis* (oder *Pegnitia* ?), worin sich Gedichte von Harsdörfer u Klai befinden.

2) Harsdörfers Frauenzimmergespräche.

3) Desselben Sontagsandachten.

4) Desselb. Nathan, Jotham u Simson.

Von Klai sollen die meisten Gedichte im 1^{ten} Th. der *Pegnesis* stehn. Was Sie sonst noch einzelnes von ihm besitzen, legen Sie wohl bei. So z. B. das geistl. Lied: Ich habe einen guten Kampf gekämpft.

Wahrscheinlich werden Harsdörfer u Klai keinen ganzen Band füllen, u ich denke dann Angelus Sil. noch hinzuzufügen. Auch um die beiden Sammlungen von diesem bitte ich Sie dann hernach. Oder wollen Sie sie gleich beilegen, wenn das Päckchen nicht zu gross geworden ist?

Ich bin diese Weihnachten in Dresden gewesen u habe dort Ebert in seinen heimatlichen Bibliothekshallen wieder begrüsst. Auch von Ihnen haben wir da viel gesprochen, von Wolfenbüttel u Ihrem Besuche. Meine Reise war eine halbe Geschäftsreise bei Übernahme eines Theils der Redaktion der grossen Encykl. von Ersch u Gruber, die diese nur bis zu G fortführen. Hassel in Weimar u ich redigiren gleichzeitig die zweite Sektion von H bis N. So ist doch ein Ende abzusehn.

Empfangen Sie die Versicherung meiner aufrichtigen dankbaren Hochachtung u Ergebenheit, mit der ich mich nenne

Ew Hochwohlgeboren

gehorsamsten Diener

W. MÜLLER.

Müller's editing of the popular and successful series, *Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts*, for F. A. Brockhaus (see Number 8), was hardly more than a commercial enterprise, which he carried out with culpable superficiality, publishing ten volumes from 1822 to 1827. The series proved, however, of real value, and is of interest to Americans as being the probable source of Longfellow's translations from Dach and Logau.

Von Meusebach, an aristocratic amateur of philological studies, was indisputably a superior connoisseur of the German literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as well as a passionate collector of books in this field. His chief legacy to posterity was his invaluable library, now incorporated in the Royal Library at Berlin. He was a close friend of Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm, and gave a hearty welcome to Hofmann von Fallersleben when the latter came to Berlin as an aspiring and impecunious young scholar. Von Meusebach had made large preparations for an edition of poets of the seventeenth century, precisely those edited by Müller: he had spent no end of work, time, and money on the project, was in possession of the best collection of original materials in existence, and had made extensive and often exhaustive researches upon various matters connected with the subject. One can only wonder at his magnanimity in placing his materials at the disposal of a man who, without special preparation, had assumed his own task.

The eighth volume of the *Bibliothek* contains the following acknowledgment:

"Die Materialien zu der Auswahl der *Ristischen* Gedichte verdanke ich sämmtlich der reichen Sammlung des Herrn von Meusebach in Berlin, dessen gefällige Bereitwilligkeit gegen

mich um so höher anzuschlagen ist, da mein Unternehmen, die Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts auszugsweise herauszugeben, einen Plan dieses gelehrten und unermüdlichen Sammlers leider gekreuzt hat. Leider, sage ich; denn das Publikum hat sich darüber gewiss mehr zu beklagen, als der, dessen Markt ich dadurch verdorben habe."

15. TO K. H. G. VON MEUSEBACH.

Dessau, 17^{ten} März 1827.

Hochverehrtester Herr Geheimerath,

Als Ankündigungsprogramm meines Besuches—ich komme nach Berlin um Palmarum u bleibe wohl ein paar Wochen da—erlauben Sie mir eine Frage u eine Bitte.

Der nächste Band meiner Bibl. d. D. enthält Günther. Von dessen Gedichten giebt es 6 Ausgaben. Ich besitze nur die 5^{te} u habe daraus meine Auswahl gemacht. Nun frage ich: enthalten die sechs Ausgaben bedeutende Varianten, u welche Ausgabe scheint Ihnen in diesem Falle die vorzüglichste?

Daran knüpft sich die Bitte, mir mit nächster Post—denn der Druck soll beginnen—die Ausgabe oder die Ausgaben zu schicken, welche neben der zu Grunde gelegten 5^{ten} besondere Berücksichtigung verdienen.

Reicht aber die 5^{te} für meine Arbeit hin—deren Oberflächlichkeit Ihnen besser bekannt ist, als mir selbst—so bedarf es weder einer Sendung, noch einer Antwort.

Mit Vergnügen sehe ich dem Augenblicke entgegen, wo ich Ihnen persönlich werde sagen können, mit welcher aufrichtigen Hochachtung u Liebe ich bin

Ihr

ganz ergebenster

W. MÜLLER.

The plan of a visit to Berlin in the spring of 1827 seems not to have been carried out: the sickness and weakness which were to end the poet's life had already fallen upon him. At the end of July he made his tour to the Rhine and South Germany, and died on September 30 at Dessau.

Günther made the tenth volume of the Bibliothek (1827), the last one edited by Müller. The series was continued by his friend Karl Förster of Dresden.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

II.—THE ORDER OF CONDITIONAL THOUGHT.

II.

5.

AN APPLICATION TO LATIN AND GREEK.

Much interest has been shown in the question of the two-clause stage of conditional speaking (parataxis) from which it is assumed that *si*- and *ei*-clauses have arisen. Much the larger share of attention has been centered on those *si*- and *ei*-clauses which refer to the future and have their verb in the subjunctive and optative moods; the burning question has been, What was the nature of the paratactic subjunctive and optative clauses from which these are sprung? With some minor differences of detail, the current answers to this question are the same, namely that these paratactic clauses were expressions of exhortation, will and the like; thus the presence of the subjunctive and optative in the hypotactic clause is explained. This eager haste to account for the presence of the subjunctive and optative in *si*- and *ei*-clauses, taken in connection with the general silence about the indicative so used, seems to betray a feeling that the indicative is a normal expression for a conditioning concept-group, and hence needs no explanation when it appears in a hypotactic conditioning clause, whereas the other two moods in question are not natural expressions for that class of thought, and therefore their use in *si*- and *ei*-clauses must be explained on other grounds. The fact that the present battle ground lies further on has distracted attention from the carelessness of this assumption that it is the subjunctive and optative that need explanation most when they appear as the expression of a conditioning group, and also from the difficulties of the further assumption that conditioning clauses develop out of hortatory and like expressions. I say that the present battle ground lies further on; for each investigator, taking for granted that the method above outlined is correct, spends his energy in trying to determine the exact nature (hortatory, volitive, optative, and the like) of the expressions from which the *si*- and *ei*-clauses are derived, often making the further attempt to square everything

to his own theory of the original force of the moods in general.¹ Putting aside these vexed questions, I would examine the validity of the underlying method so generally assumed to be correct.²

The fundamental difficulty of the assumption that protases with verbs in the subjunctive and optative moods are to be referred to hortatory and like origins is that a hypotactic conditional sentence is evolved from collocations of which the following may be taken as an example,

"Let us give him food; he will go away".

But (cf. the case cited in section 4) the first clause in this combination is a bona fide exhortation—nothing more or less; the words "he will go away" are the one-clause expression of a Consequence Period. For the speaker does not will that the person in question be given food *until* he apprehends that such action will get rid of him. No matter how swift the process of thought may be, the order is unquestionably,

"If we give him food, he will go away; let us give it".

It is doubtless true that sentences of the type,

"Let us give him food; he will go away",

stood side by side with paratactic conditional speaking, just as they now stand beside it and hypotactic conditional speaking as well; but there is no evidence that they influenced the mood of protasis, and, least of all, that any form of protasis is evolved from them. Indeed, the analysis of the thought in the example above shows the extreme difficulty of such an evolution. If that demonstration is not wholly convincing, the argument from the negative can hardly fail to complete the proof. Thus Schmalz (Lat. Gramm.³ § 338) notes that *ne=ni*, in this way quite consistently providing for the evolution of a negative condition from a prohibition. But complete such a collocation; e. g.;

"Don't do it; you will be hurt".

¹ An interesting example of this is Hale's paper on The Origin of Subjunctive and Optative Conditions in Greek and Latin, Harvard Studies in Clas. Phil., Vol., XII (1901) p. 109 ff., and the review of the same by Dittmar, Berl. Phil. Woch. Vol. XXII, Nos. 11 and 12 (Mch. 15 and 22, 1902).

² This method I outline as it is generally understood. If I do injustice to any, a restatement is in order. It will then be possible to measure the same by the considerations noted in this paper.

According to the theory discussed this should yield,

"If you don't do it, you will be hurt".

This of course is impossible—it just reverses the speaker's meaning; his thought and its order are,

"If you do that, you will be hurt; don't do it".

The difficulty may be more patent in this example, but it is just as real in the other, and it throws a heavy burden of proof on those who maintain that subjunctive and optative *si*- and *ei*-clauses are evolved from hortatory, volitive, and like expressions.

In the second place, with reference to the assumption that the subjunctive and optative moods are a less natural expression for a conditioning concept-group than is the indicative. We may perhaps judge of this best by taking a concrete example; suppose a mother sees her child standing before the fire, apparently deliberating whether to touch it or not; her thought will instantly leap to the result of such a course of action, and she might express herself paratactically,

"Touch fire, burn hand".

The underlying thought is a Consequence Period, and the words "Touch fire" are the expression of a conditioning concept-group. Now what mood would be most naturally used in this conditioning clause? When the mother utters the words she does not know nor does she express an opinion as to whether the act in question will or will not happen; but if the matter be pressed along those lines, we can say no more than that the speaker apprehends that the act *may perhaps* happen. Is the indicative the mood of all moods to fit situations of this sort? The very fact that the speaker is not asserting that an act will take place, and is simply naming a possibility suggested to her mind by the action of another, ought, it seems to me, to raise a very serious doubt about the correctness of the assumption that the indicative is any more suited to be the expression of a conditioning concept-group than are the subjunctive and optative moods.¹ May I not

¹ It is possible that my point of view in this paragraph may be misunderstood. In calling attention to the fact that a conditioning clause is not an assertion, I mean to merely bring out the fact that a conditioning concept-group has no more affinity for the usual range of meaning assigned to the indicative than for that assigned to the subjunctive or optative—not meaning,

go a step further and say that when the question is considered (as here) with reference simply to the nature of the thought to be expressed, it seems altogether probable that all three moods stood originally in paratactic protasis *on their own merits*, i. e., that the range of meaning attached to these various mood forms was wide enough to include, in each case, the expression of this peculiar kind of intellection we call a conditioning concept-group.

It is possible to pass judgment on this question without introducing any prejudice arising from individual views as to the original meaning of the moods. For those who hold that mood forms had originally fixed and differentiated meanings, will, I think, find that the range of meanings assigned by them to subjunctive and optative forms would easily include the expression of a conditioning concept-group—if anything, more easily than would the range of meaning assigned to the indicative. Those, on the other hand, who hold to the theory that the meaning attached to early mood forms was vague and shifting will find still less difficulty in conceiving of a conditioning concept-group as finding expression in different moods; on their hypothesis such a variety of expression would be the thing to be expected. If we once grant that all three moods may have stood in paratactic protasis *on their own merits*, the presence of these moods in hypotactic *si* and *ei*-clauses obviously no longer forces us to shoulder the very serious difficulty which (as shown above) is involved in the assumption that these hypotactic clauses are an evolution from hortatory, volitive and like expressions.¹

of course, that it coincides with any of the ordinarily recognized functions of these two last named moods; for a conditioning concept-group is *sui generis*, and its verbal expression is therefore a *sui generis* use of whatever mood is employed. My contention is merely that the thought of a conditioning clause shows enough affinity for the meanings usually assigned to the subjunctive and optative to make it just as natural to suppose that it in some cases used these moods as it is to suppose that the indicative was so used in others. In passing judgment on this point I must ask the reader to exclude anything that would come under the head of general "conditions"; for the thought there involved differs in a very important particular from that in a pure conditioning clause.

¹One of the reasons that led to this assumption originally was doubtless the conception of parataxis referred to in footnote, p. 37, namely, that, in reconstructing a parataxis, we should not assume a use of a mood not found in independent sentences. From this point of view it was quite natural to look to hortatory, optative and like expressions as a source from which to develop

In view of the nature of conditional thought as described in this paper, and with further illumination from the discussion of the current view of the genesis of *si*- and *ei*-clauses in this section, we might thus write a chapter in the history of Latin and Greek conditional speaking. At one time pairs of clauses (with the aid of various defining elements, such as the tone of voice and the general circumstances under which the words were spoken) were a common means for the expression of conditional thought-periods. Inasmuch as the thought formed a *period* there was an inner connection of meaning between the clauses, but the function of conveying this meaning had not yet been delegated to a single word. In the clause that gave expression to the conditioning group sometimes one, sometimes another mood was found, the different moods being used on their own merits as natural expressions for the peculiar kind of thought to be conveyed. Taking for granted (as is very possibly the case) that *si*- and *ei*-clauses are not the result of substitution (the fourth stage described in section 4), it only remained for the forms which we know as *si* and *ei* to become the felt verbal expression of the inner connection of meaning existing between the clauses in the paratactic combinations in order to produce the hypotactic periods of historical times.¹

To complete the presentation of my theory as to the nature of subjunctive and optative uses in the paratactic stage of Latin and Greek conditional speaking, it is necessary to consider two forms of expression that are found in Latin alongside of the *si*-clause. One is the conditional clause "with *si* omitted", the

si- and *ei*-clauses. Strangely enough, it was not noticed that the use of the indicative in a conditioning clause is *sui generis*—it cannot be paralleled in independent sentences, and for the simple reason that a conditioning concept-group torn away from a conditioned group at once ceases to be such. Admitting the *sui generis* use of the indicative in parataxis, there is no bar to supposing a similar use of the other moods. Perhaps we should not be surprised at the failure to recognize that the meaning of the indicative in protasis is a peculiar and distinctive one, for even yet it is no rarity to find in Latin grammars a statement to the effect that the indicative "states the condition as a fact".

¹ It will be noted that no attempt is here made to determine the process by which *si* and *ei* became attached to conditioning clauses; that question may perhaps be solved by reconstruction. The origin of the use of the subjunctive and optative in protasis I conceive to be too remote to be reached in that way; I therefore construct it from the nature of conditional thought itself.

other is a sort of emasculated volitive subjunctive. This last may be illustrated by such a passage as—

Juv. Sat. XVI, 29 ff.;

Da testem, iudex cum dixerit, *audeat* ille
Nescio quis, pugnoscui vidit, dicere Vidi,
Et credam dignum barba dignumque capillis
Maiorum.

Here the coordinating conjunction *Et* shows that *audeat* means "Let him dare" and not "Should he dare". There is a use of the imperative quite parallel to this; e. g.—

Pers. Sat. I, 48 ff.;

Sed recti finemque extremumque esse recuso
Euge tuum et belle. Nam belle hoc *excutite* totum;
Quid non intus habet?

It is not always possible to decide whether we are dealing with this emasculated use of the volitive subjunctive or with a simple paratactic conditioning clause. On the written page our feeling is influenced by the punctuation. This may be seen by reading the following passages from Juvenal, first with a semicolon, then with a comma—

Sat. III, 78;

Graeculus esuriens in caelum *iusseris*; ibit.

Sat. VI, 331 ff.;

Abstuleris spem
Servorum; venit et conductus aquarius.

Sat. VI, 627 ff.;

Oderunt natos de paelice; nemo *repugnet*,
Nemo *vetet*; iam iam privignum occidere fas est.

Sat. XIII, 214 ff.;

Albani veteris pretiosa senectus
Displicet; *ostendas* melius; densissima ruga
Cogitur in frontem velut acri ducta Falerno.

Read with a semicolon each of these passages appear to have the weakened volitive force sometimes shown by the subjunctive.

The other form of expression to which I have referred—the conditional clause "with *si* omitted"—perhaps represents an unbroken tradition from a time when paratactic conditional speak-

ing was the rule. Here if anywhere is to be found the recourse to parataxis (Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*² §335) that may instruct us as to the nature of early paratactic speaking. E. g.—

Hor. Sat. II. 5. 74 ff.;

Scribet mala carmina vecors,
Laudato.

Here is an example of the indicative in its *sui generis* use as the expression of a conditioning concept-group. Lane (*Lat. Gram.* 1701) cites another interesting case of the same kind—

Plaut. Ps. 863;

si iste ibit, ito ; stabit, astato simul.

It is harder to find examples of the subjunctive that all will admit are used in just this way. For, as noted above, we have only to strengthen the punctuation in many cases to suggest to the reader the emasculated volitive use of the mood. However Lane (*Lat. Gram.* 1574) vouches for the fact that the parallel weakened use of the imperative appears but *once* in early Latin. In view of that statement we ought not to assume a large use of the weakened volitive subjunctive as early as Plautus at any rate, for the two uses seem equally rhetorical; the weaker punctuation (comma) would in most cases probably be a truer guide to the writer's thought. But, aside from any such consideration, there are clear cases enough. E. g.—

Cic. in Verr. II. 5. 65. 168;

cognosceret hominen, aliquid de summo supplicio remitteres;
si ignoraret, tum . . . hoc iuris in omnes constitueres.

In view of *si ignoraret* it is hard to escape the conclusion that, to Cicero, *cognosceret* meant "should he recognize the man," i. e., that it is the simple and direct expression of a conditioning concept-group. There is no need to multiply examples, for this use of the subjunctive is generally recognized. But some emphasis does need to be laid on the probable frequency of its occurrence in Latin, and on its peculiar claim to recognition as a living descendant of ancient paratactic conditional speaking.¹

¹ Despite its rhetorical character and apparently late development, Hale (*Harvard Studies*, XII, p. 116) proposes to make the emasculated volitive use a step in the development of *si*- and *ei*-clauses. He accepts as correct the method which evolves these from volitive and like expressions, but feels the

The customary treatment of this subject will lead the reader to expect that something will be said about the negative in paratactic protasis. In attacking that question one should put aside any prejudice arising from a theory concerning the negative used with early hortatory, optative or like expressions, for according to the theory here proposed these do not figure in the evolution

difficulty (pointed out earlier in this section) in passing from e. g., an exhortation to a hypotactic conditioning clause. He proposes that we make the emasculated use of the volitive subjunctive which grows out of a genuine volitive use an intermediate step. This is looking in the right direction in so far as it is an attempt to get rid of the troublesome element of will that is so conspicuously absent from the *si*- and *ei*-clauses; but it does not bridge the chasm to the latter. For the emasculated volitive subjunctive is no more ripe for a change to hypotaxis than is the weakened imperative (see above, Pers. Sat. I. 48 ff.) In these weakened uses the force of the two moods is practically identical, and the subjunctive as little as the imperative could be forced, grammatically speaking, into a subordinate clause. But waiving this consideration, there still remains another difficulty. If we accept Hale's view, we are asked to suppose that subjunctive and optative uses in independent sentences became fixed much as they are in the historical period, that (presumably much later) weakened uses corresponding to the literal meanings sprang up, and that, after some further development, these moods appeared as the direct and unqualified expression of a conditioning concept-group. One feels moved to ask: Was there no such thing as a simple, pure conditioning clause containing any mood except the indicative until the meanings of subjunctive and optative forms passed through this long process of development?

The necessity of shouldering such difficulties at once vanishes if we but admit that the subjunctive and the optative are as natural an expression for a conditioning concept-group as is the indicative. Then we are free to suppose that any of these moods may have stood in the conditioning clauses of sentences of the type: "Touch fire, burn hand." On that hypothesis the presence of all three mood forms in *si*- and *ei*-clauses calls for no explanation or apology; in fact it is just the thing to be expected. Further, this hypothesis does not compel us to assume a paratactic form from which it is difficult to evolve a hypotactic conditional sentence, for sentences of the type "Touch fire, burn hand," are the expression of conditional thought-periods pure and simple—a process of thought that is in all essential particulars identical with that which finds expression in the hypotactic conditional sentence. At the time when paratactic speaking was the rule we may well suppose that, *alongside of* the two-clause conditional sentence there stood the one-clause type with exhortation or prohibition prefixed (e. g., "Let us give him food; he will go away," and "Don't do it; you will be hurt"), the exhortation or prohibition in these expressions affecting not at all the mood of paratactic protasis. As for the emasculated volitive use of the subjunctive, we may say that it seems to be a late and rhetorical use occasionally employed as a sort of mechanical substitute for a hypotactic conditioning clause.

of the hypotactic conditional clause. Taking up the problem without any preconceived notion, the fact that the exclusive negative for *et*-clauses is $\mu\eta$, whereas in Latin the corresponding form *ne* does not appear in hypotactic conditioning clauses (except perchance in a disguised form) though *non* is used quite freely, inclines one to believe that the early use of negatives in paratactic protasis was not very discriminating. The somewhat unsettled use of negatives in general even as late as Plautus makes such a supposition less difficult. In Greek a similar question may be raised with reference to the presence of $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\alpha\upsilon$ in paratactic protasis. Here we are not left to conjecture. For, as late as Homer, hypotactic protases containing either future indicative, subjunctive or optative forms, may or may not have $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$ or $\alpha\upsilon$ with their verb (Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, § 460). The same, or even a more, unsettled use is doubtless to be assumed for an earlier period. However, it is doubtful whether this question should be raised at all with reference to the very remote period under discussion.

6.

Before leaving this subject one other point should be touched upon, namely, the syntactical form in which conditional thought finds expression, e. g., in the interrogative conditional sentence. The interrogative form has two varieties, distinguished in Latin as *Sentence* and *Quis* Questions. Conditional thought in the Consequence order finds natural expression in the *Sentence* Question. E. g., take the thought which underlies the sentence used in section 2 as an expression of a Consequence Period:

"If we do that (i. e., take out the prop), the wall will fall".

In a course of thought otherwise just like this, the speaker may not be absolutely sure that the coming to pass of one event entails the coming to pass of another, though he sees that such a relation is probably to be assumed. If, in such a case, he feels called upon to express his thought to those whom he knows to be less well informed than himself about the matter in question, he will be apt to qualify his presentation by "perhaps" or the like:

"If we take out the prop, *perhaps* the wall will fall".

On the other hand, if conscious that the hearers are better

informed than himself, the same Consequence Period might lead him to ask,

"If we take out the prop, will the wall fall?"

A simple Proviso Period uninfluenced by preceding groups cannot call for expression in this interrogative form. For if we take the sentence used in section 3 as an illustration of thought in the Proviso order,

"He will come—that is, if it does not rain",

and add an element of uncertainty that might lead the speaker to ask,

"Will he come—that is, if it does not rain?"

this uncertainty no longer concerns (as above) the relation between the conditioning and the conditioned groups, but the fact that "Will he come?" is a question shows that the group *is already contingent* before the conditioning group appears in the mind; later it is again modified by this conditioning group. The fact that the (ultimately) conditioned group of every simple Proviso Period does not become contingent until the possible hindering circumstance, on the converse of which the conditioning clause is based, rises in consciousness, seems to preclude this order of conditional thought from finding a natural expression in the type of conditional sentence now under discussion.

The Quis Question may appear when a speaker apprehends that the coming to pass of one event entails something, the exact nature of which he does not know, e. g.,

"If we take out the prop, *what* will happen?"

Both Consequence and Proviso Periods may find expression in this type of conditional sentence.

In a discussion of the order of conditional thought the other syntactical forms seem to offer little of interest, the two orders apparently finding expression in them with equal facility. E. g., the apodosis may be an expression of will or the like:

"If he pulls out the prop, run".

"Come—that is, if it does not rain".

The same is true of the negative, whether it appears in protasis or apodosis, as the reader may readily see for himself by manipu-

lating the examples already given as illustrations of Consequence and Proviso Periods. The main point of interest here, perhaps, is the fondness of the Proviso Period for expression in sentences using as the negative for the conditioning clause "unless" (*nisi*), e. g.,

"He will come—that is, unless it rains".

"He will not come—that is, unless he is obliged".

7.

In drawing to a close the discussion of the order of conditional thought, it would perhaps be well to state again the point of view of this paper and sum up its results. The point of departure in the investigation is conditional *thought*—meaning by that term, not the process by which words are chosen for the expression of that thought, but *the thought itself*, this last often being so rapid that it may be completed before the speaker can single out the first word for its expression. First has been considered the difference in this "scheme of thought" according to the order of the conditioning and conditioned groups. Then follows a description of the verbal forms through which conditional thought finds expression (sections 4 and 6), with a concrete application to the problem of Latin and Greek conditional speaking.

Syntax will now come forward with a pile of written hypotactic conditional sentences, asking a very different question from those raised above, namely, whether we may classify sentences according as the speaker's thought is a Consequence or a Proviso Period, and if so, how. In attacking this problem, it may be first noted that the thought which finds expression in the conditional *sentence* varies widely; at least three categories may be recognized. In the first place, many conditional sentences are the expression of Consequence and Proviso Periods that flash through the speaker's mind simply and naturally, suggested by the surroundings in which he is. A second class of conditional sentences are those which express a more artificial type of conditional thought; e. g., a person who is writing a careful and studied composition may lean back in his chair with a long course of thought mapped out in his mind, considering what form of words will produce the most desirable effect on the hearer; as a train of words suggests itself to his mind, he accepts

it or rejects it solely from this point of view. If in this train of *words* there chances to occur a conditional sentence, I suppose some conditional thought accompanies them, but it certainly lacks the spontaneous character of that in the first class mentioned. A more striking illustration of this artificial type of conditional thought is seen when a person "thinks up" a conditional sentence that does not express his real sentiment at all, that he may use it as a means of deceiving the hearer as to his own state of mind.¹ The third category contains those conditional sentences which are not the expression of conditional thought at all really. We may even question whether we should not include in this class such stock expressions as,

"I would not do that, if I were you".

When a mother says this to her child, does she really put herself in the child's place and forecast her own action under the circumstances? I doubt it, in the great majority of cases; she is probably merely repeating a form of words she has fallen into a way of using when she wishes to discourage a certain line of action—the sentence is really the expression of a mild prohibition.²

In trying to classify sentences according to the thought order, sentences of this third class must be counted out, for they provide no conditional thought for us to classify. As for the sentences that fall within the other two categories, it should be noted that the order of *clauses* in the hypotactic sentence is altogether unreliable as an indication of the speaker's thought order. Often the variation between the two is the result of a

¹ In some ways similar to these situations and yet different from them is the case of a person who *repeats*, either exactly or in substance, a conditional sentence that has been spoken in his hearing or that he has read. This must happen very often, e. g., in the writing of history.

² Another example of the same kind is afforded by sentences of the type "If I know anything, I know this"; such a sentence is only an artificial way of saying "I am very certain of this". Even the spontaneous diction of Plautus goes thus far:

Amph. 271 ff.:

Certe edepol, si quicquamst aliud quod credam aut certo sciam,
Credo ego hac noctu Nocturnum obdormivisse ebrium.

This type of sentence is very common later; see Cic. ad Att. I. 16. 1, ad Fam. VI. 14. 1, XV. 4. 13.

wholly natural tendency to leave unexpressed or relegate to second place what will be readily understood, presenting only or first the new idea. Thus, in the example of a Consequence Period used in section 2, when A says to B "Let us take out this prop", B's order of thought is faithfully represented by "If we do that, the wall will fall". However, the idea "our taking out the prop" is already present in the minds of both speakers; in B's mind it becomes a conditioning concept-group, as it suggests to him the outcome of the projected action. If B should choose to give full verbal expression to his last thought only, and say "The wall will fall", A would probably catch his meaning because he knows the starting point of the thought. Wishing to make himself perfectly clear, B might add as a tag to the words above, "if we do that", the whole sentence, "The wall will fall, if we do that", thus, by a wholly natural process, using in its clauses an order just the reverse of that of the thought. Similarly in the Proviso Period the new thought (in this case the conditioning group) may find expression in the prior clause. To use the same example as in section 3, when A says to B, "I want C to come over to my house this afternoon. Do you think he will come?" B's thought order is faithfully represented by "He will come, if it does not rain". But he would be perfectly well understood if he should say simply, "If it does not rain;" or, if he chose, he might add to this the further clause, "he will come", i. e., "If it does not rain, he will come", thus again naturally enough using an order of clauses the reverse of that of the thought.

Our main reliance in determining the thought order is the ability to detect the presence or the absence of the implication (e. g., "otherwise not") that goes with the Proviso Period (see section 3). Wherever we feel this implication to be a part of the speaker's thought or of the thought he wishes to suggest to the hearer, we may classify the sentence under the Proviso category, there being no objection to extending the use of this name to cover the sentence by which this order of conditional thought is conveyed. The tone and manner of the speaker are potent factors in suggesting to the hearer the Proviso implication, and this puts us somewhat at a disadvantage in dealing with the written page. But our understanding of the general situation in which the words are spoken helps to a conclusion as to the presence or the absence of the implication, as, for instance, in dealing

with the language of a spirited dialogue such as may be found in Plautus; in such cases we can also sometimes see how the words of one speaker suggest a concept-group to the mind of another, and we can determine with almost absolute certainty the order of the latter's thought according as this group finds expression in the protasis or the apodosis of his reply. I leave the matter with these few suggestions, the present discussion being one of general principles merely.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

H. C. NUTTING.

III.—THE IMPERFECT INDICATIVE IN EARLY LATIN.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

It is the purpose of this paper to define and differentiate the various uses of the imperfect indicative, to discover if possible their origin and trace their interrelations, to outline in fact the history of the tense in early Latin. The term 'early Latin' is used somewhat elastically as including not only all the remains of the language down to about the time of Sulla, but also the first volume of inscriptions (to 44 B. C.) and the works of Varro, for Varro belongs distinctly to the older school of writers in spite of the fact that the *Rerum rusticarum libri* were written as late as 37 B. C. But exact chronological periods are of little meaning in matters of this sort, and the present outline, being but a fragment of a more complete history of the tense, may stop at this point as well as another.

Before proceeding to the investigation of the cases of the imperfect occurring in early Latin it is necessary to describe briefly the system by which these cases have been classified. In the first place all cases of the same verb have been placed together so that the individual verb forms the basis of classification.¹ Then verbs of similar meanings have been combined to form larger groups. There result three main groups (and some subdivisions) which for the better understanding of this paper may be tabulated thus:

- I. Verbs of physical action or state.
 - 1. Motion of the whole of a body, e. g. *eo, curro*.
 - 2. Action of a part of a body, e. g. *do, iacio*.
 - 3. Verbal communication, e. g. *dico, promitto*.
 - 4. Rest or state, e. g. *sum, sto, sedeo*.
- II. Verbs of psychic action or state.
 - 1. Thought, e. g. *puto, scio, spero*.
 - 2. Feeling, e. g. *metuo, amo*.
 - 3. Will, e. g. *volo, nolo*.

¹ Cf. Trans. Am. Philolog. Ass., XXX, 1899, pp. 14-15.

III. Auxiliary verbs, i. e. verbs which represent such English words as *could, should, might, &c., &c.*, e. g. *possum, oportet, decet*.

Such a system has, of course, many inconsistencies. The verb *ago*, for instance, may be a verb of action (I. 2) or of verbal communication (I. 3), but since instances of this sort were comparatively rare and affected no important groups of verbs it has seemed best not to separate cases of the same verb.

Again I. 3 is logically a part of I. 2, or the verbs grouped under III might perhaps have been distributed among the different subdivisions of I and II. But the object of the classification, to discover the function of each case, has seemed best attained by grouping the verbs as described. By this system verbs of similar meaning, whose tenses are therefore similarly affected, are brought together and this is the essential point. In a very large collection of cases a stricter subdivision would doubtless prove of advantage.

2. THE FACTS¹ OF USAGE.

There are about 1400 cases of the imperfect indicative in the period covered by this investigation. Of these, however, it has been necessary to exclude² from 175 to 180 leaving 1226 from a consideration of which the results have been obtained. The tense appears, therefore, not to have been a favorite, and its comparative infrequency which I have noted already for Plautus and Terence³ may here be asserted for the whole period of early Latin. About three-quarters of the total number of cases are supplied by Plautus, Terence, and Varro (see Table I).

A study of these 1226 cases reveals three general uses of the imperfect indicative:

I. The progressive or true imperfect.

II. The aoristic imperfect.

III. The 'shifted' imperfect.

Let us consider these in order.

¹ In the following pages I have made an effort to state and illustrate the facts, reserving theory and discussion for the third section of this paper.

² These are cases doubtful for one reason or another, chiefly because of textual corruption or insufficient context. For the latter reason perhaps too many cases have been excluded, but I have chosen to err in this direction since so much of the material consists of fragments where one cannot feel absolutely certain of the force of the tense.

³ Trans. Am. Philolog. Ass., XXX, p. 22.

The true imperfect shows several subdivisions:

I A. The simple progressive imperfect.

I B. The imperfect of customary past action.

I C. The frequentative imperfect.

Of these I A and I B include several more or less distinct variations, but all three uses together with their subdivisions betray their relationship by the fact that all possess or are immediately derived from the progressive¹ function. This progressive idea, the indication of an act as progressing, going on, taking place, in past time or the indication of a state as vivid, is the true ear-mark of the tense. The time may be in the distant past or at any point between that and the immediate past or it may even in many contexts extend into the present. In duration the time may be so short as to be inappreciable or it may extend over years. The time is, however, not a distinguishing mark of the imperfect. The perfect may be described in the same terms.

The kind of action² remains, therefore, the real criterion in the distinction³ of the imperfect from other past tenses.

I A. THE SIMPLE PROGRESSIVE IMPERFECT.

Under this heading are included all cases in which the tense indicates simple progressive action, i. e. something in the 'doing', 'being',⁴ &c. The idea of progression is present in all the cases, but there are in other respects considerable differences according to which some distinct varieties may be noted. All told there are 680 cases of this usage constituting more than half the total (1226).

¹ I have chosen *progressive* as more expressive than *durative* which seems to emphasize too much the time.

² 'Kind of action' will translate the convenient German *Aktionsart* while 'time' or 'period of time' may stand for *Zeitstufe*.

³ Herbig in his very interesting discussion, *Aktionsart und Zeitstufe* (I. F. 1896), §107, comes to the conclusion that 'Aktionsart' is older than 'Zeitstufe' and that though many tenses are used timelessly none are used in living speech without 'Aktionsart.'

⁴ The progressive effect is also found in the present participle (and in participial adjectives), and indeed the imperfect, especially in subordinate clauses, is often interchangeable with a participial expression, falling naturally into participial form in English also. How close the effect of the imperfect was to that of the present participle is well illustrated by Terence, *Heaut.* 293-4 *nebat . . . texebat* and 285 *texentem . . . offendimus*. Cf. Varro R. R. III, 2. 2 cited on p. 167.

Of these 449 are syntactically independent, 231 dependent.¹ In its ordinary form this usage is so well understood that we may content ourselves with a few illustrations extending over the different groups of verbs.

I. 1. Verbs of motion.

Plautus,² Aul. 178, Praesagibat mi animus frustra me ire, quom *exibam* domo.

¹ With the principles of formal description as last and best expressed by Morris (On Principles and Methods of Syntax, 1901, pp. 197-8) all syntacticians will, I believe, agree. Nearly all of them will be found well illustrated in the present paper. For purposes of tense study, however, I have been unable to see any essential modification in function resulting from variation of person and number, although some uses have become almost idiomatic in certain persons, e. g. the immediate past usage with first person sing. of verbs of motion (p. 15). Just how far tense function is affected by the kind of sentence in which the tense stands I am not prepared to say. In cases accompanied by a negative or standing in an interrogative sentence the tense function is more difficult to define than in simple affirmative sentences. It is easier also to define the tense function in some forms of dependent clauses, e. g. temporal, causal, than in others. This is an interesting phenomenon, needing for its solution a larger and more varied collection of cases than mine. At present I do not feel that the influence upon the tense of any of these elements is definite enough to call for greater complexity in the system of classification. While, therefore, I have borne these points constantly in mind, the tables show the results rather than the complete method of my work in this respect.

² In the citation of cases the following editions are used:

Fragments of the dramatists, O. Ribbeck, Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta (I & II), Lipsiae 1897-8 (third edition).

Plautus, Goetz and Schoell, T. Macci Plauti comoediae (editio minor), Lipsiae 1892-6.

Terence, Dziatzko, P. Terenti Afri comoediae, Lipsiae 1884.

Orators, H. Meyer, Oratorum romanorum fragmenta, Turici 1842.

Historians, C. Peter, Historicorum Romanorum fragmenta, Lipsiae 1883.

Cato, H. Keil, M. Porci Catonis de agricultura liber, Lipsiae 1895, and H. Jordan, M. Catonis praeter lib. de re rustica quae extant, Lipsiae 1860.

Lucilius, L. Mueller, Leipsic 1872.

Auctor ad Herennium, C. L. Kayser, Cornifici rhetoricorum ad C. Herennium libri tres, Lipsiae 1854.

Inscriptions, Th. Mommsen, C. I. L. I.

Ennius (the Annals), L. Mueller, Q. Enni carminum reliquiae, Petropoli 1884.

Naevius (Bell. poen.), L. Mueller, Q. Enni carminum reliquiae, Petropoli 1884.

Varro, H. Keil, M. Terenti Varronis rerum rusticarum libri tres, Lipsiae 1883.

Varro, A. Spengel, M. Terenti Varronis de lingua latina, Berolini 1885.

Varro, Bücheler, M. Terenti Varronis saturarum Menippearum reliquiae, Lipsiae 1865.

Id. Amph. 199, Nam quom pugnabant maxume, ego tum
fugiebam maxume.

Lucilius, Sat., XVI. 12, '*ibat* forte aries' inquit;

I. 2. Verbs of action.

Ex incertis incertorum fabulis (comoed. pall.) p. 137, XXIV.

R., sed sibi cum tetulit coronam ob coligandas nuptias,

Tibi *ferebat*; cum simulabat se sibi alacriter dare,

Tum ad te ludibunda docte et delicate detulit.

Plautus, Truc. 198 . . . atque opperimino: iam exhibit, nam
lavabat.

Cf. id. Men. 564 (*ferebam*), Mil. 1336 (*temptabam*), Epid.
138 (*mittebam*); Terence, Andr. 545 (*dabam*); Auctor ad
Herenn. 4, 20, 27 (*oppetebat*).

I. 3. Verbal communication.

Plautus, Men. 1053,

Quin modo

Erupui, homines qui *ferebant* te . . .

Apud hasce aedis. tu *clamabas* deum fidem,

Ex incert. incert. &c. 282. XXXII. R., Vidi te, Ulixes saxo
sternentem Hectora,

Vidi tegentem clipeo classem Doricam:

Ego tunc pudendam trepidus *hortabar* fugam.

I. 4. State.

Plautus, Aul. 376, Atque eo fuerunt cariora, aes non *erat*.

Id. Mil. 181, Sed Philocomasium hicine etiam nunc est? Pe.
Quom exhibam, hic *erat*.

Varro, R. R. III. 2. 2., ibi Appium Claudium augurem
sedentem invenimus . . . *sedebat* ad sinistram ei Cornelius
Merula . . .

Cf. also Plautus, Rud. 846, (*sedebant*), Amph. 603 (*stabam*)
&c. &c.

II. 1. Verbs of thought.

Hist. frag. p. 70, l. 7, Et tum quo irent *nesciebant*, ilico
manserunt.

Plautus, Pseud. 500-1, Non a me *scibas* pistrinum in mundo
tibi,

Quom ea muss[c]itabas? Ps. *Scibam*.

Cf. also Plautus, Rud. 1186, (*credebam*); Varro R. R. I. 2. 25.
(*ignorabat*), &c.

II. 2. Feeling.

Plautus, Epid. 138, *Desipiebam* mentis, quom illa scripta
mittebam tibi.

Id. Bacch. 683, Bacchidem atque hunc *suspīcabar* propter crimen, Chrysale,

II. 3. Will.

Lucilius, Sat. incert. 48, fingere praeterea adferri quod quisque *volebat*:

In these cases the act or state indicated by the tense is always viewed as at some considerable distance in the past even though in reality it may be distant by only a few seconds. The speaker or writer stands aloof, so to speak, and views the event as at some distance and as confined within certain fairly definite limits in the past. If, now, the action be conceived as extending to the immediate past or the present of the speaker, a different effect is produced, although merely the limits within which the action progresses have been extended. This phase of the progressive imperfect we might term the imperfect of the immediate past¹ or the interrupted² imperfect, since the action of the verb is often interrupted either by accomplishment or by some other event. A few citations will make these points clearer:

Plautus, Stich. 328, ego quid me velles *visēbam*.

Nam mequidem harum *miserebat*. = 'I was coming to see what you wanted of me (when I met you); for I've been pitying (and still pity) these women.' In the first verb the action is interrupted by the meeting; in the second it continues into the present, the closest translation being our English compound progressive perfect, a tense which Latin lacked. The imperfect *ibam* is very common in this usage, cf. Plautus, Truc. 921, At ego ad te *ibam* = I was on my way to see you (when you called me), cf. Varro, R. R. II. 11. 12; Terence, Phorm. 900, Andr. 580.

But the usage is by no means confined to verbs of motion (I. 1) alone. It extends over all the categories:

I. 2. Motion.

Plautus, Aulul. 827 (*apparabas*), cf. Andr. 656.

¹ In Greek the aorist is used of events just past, but of course with no progressive coloring, cf. Brugmann in I. Müller's Handbuch, &c., II², p. 185.

² E. Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plautino quaest. selectae, Argentorati 1888, pp. 11-12, recognizes and correctly explains this usage, adding some examples of similar thoughts expressed by the present, e. g. Plautus, Men. 280 (*quaeris*), ibid. 675 (*quaerit*), Amph. 542 (*numquid vis*, a common leave-taking formula). In such cases the speaker uses imperfect or present according as past or present predominates in his mind, the balance between the two being pretty even.

I. 3. Verbal communication.

Terence, Eun. 378 (*iocabar*), Heaut. 781 (*dicebam*); Plautus, Trin. 212 (*aibant*).

I. 4. Rest.

Plautus, Cas. 532 (*eram*), cf. Men. 1135. Terence, Eun. 87 (*stabam*), Phorm. 573 (*commorabar*).

II. 1. Thought.

Terence, Phorm. 582 (*scibam*), cf. Heaut. 309. Plautus, Men. 1072 (*censebam*), cf. Bacch. 342, As. 385 &c.

II. 2. Feeling.

Plautus, Stich. 329 (*miserebas*); Turpilius, 107 V R. (*sperabam*).

II. 3. Will.

Plautus, As. 392 and 395 (*volebam*), Most. 9, Poen. 1231.¹

III. Auxiliary verbs.

Plautus, Epid. 98 (*solebam*), cf. Amph. 711. Terence, Phormio 52 (*conabar*).

In this usage the present or immediate past is in the speaker's mind only less strongly than the point in the past at which the verb's action begins. The pervading influence of the present is evident not only because present events are usually at hand in the context, but also from the occasional use with the imperfect of a temporal particle or expression of the present, cf. Plaut. Merc. 884, *Quo nunc ibas* = 'whither were you (are you) going?' Terence, Andr. 657, *immo etiam, quom tu minus scis aerumnas meas,*

Haec nuptiae non adparabantur mihi,

¹ Rodenbusch (p. 26) labors hard to show that this case is like the preceding and not parallel with the cases of *volui* which he cites on p. 24 with all of which an infinitive of the verb in the main clause is either expressed or to be supplied. Following Bothe, he alters *deicere* to *dice* (which he assigns to Adelphasium) and refers *quod* to the *amabo* and *amplexabor* of 1230 = 'meine Absicht'. But there is no need of this. Infinitives occur with some of the cases cited by Rodenbusch himself on p. 11, e. g. Bacch. 188 (189) *Istuc volebam . . . percontarier*, Trin. 195 *Istuc volebam scire*, to which may be added Cas. 674 *Dicere vilicum volebam* and *ibid. 702 illud . . . dicere volebam*. It is true that the perfect is more common in such passages, but the imperfect is by no means excluded. The difference is simply one of the speaker's point of view: *quod volui* = 'what I wished' (complete); *quod volebam* = 'what I was and am wishing' (incomplete). As. 212, which also troubles Rodenbusch, is customary past.

Nec *postulabat nunc* quisquam uxorem dare.

Merc. 197, Equidem me *iam* censebam esse in terra atque in tuto loco:

Verum video . . .

In the last two cases note the accompanying presents, *scis* and *video*.

The immediate past also is indicated by a particle, e. g. Plautus, Cas. 594 ad te hercle *ibam* commodum.

There are in all 207¹ cases of this imperfect of the immediate past. They are distributed pretty evenly over the various groups of verbs as will be seen from the following table:

	No. of Cases.
I. 1 Verbs of motion,	26
I. 2 " " action,	17
I. 3 " " verbal communication,	31
I. 4 " " state,	35
II. 1 " " thought,	36
II. 2 " " feeling,	35
II. 3 " " will,	13
III. Auxiliary verbs,	14
	<hr/>
	207

The verbs proportionately most common in this use are *ibam* and *volebam* which have become idiomatic. The usage is especially common in colloquial Latin, but 16 cases² occurring outside the dramatic literature represented chiefly, of course, by Plautus and Terence.

By virtue of its progressive force the imperfect is a vivid tense and as is well known, became a favorite means in the Ciceronian period of enlivening descriptive passages. It was especially used to fill in the details and particulars of a picture (imperfect of situation).³ This use of the tense appears in early Latin also, but with much less frequency. The choice of the tense for this purpose is a matter of art, whether conscious or unconscious. At times, indeed, there is no apparent reason for the selection of an imperfect rather than a perfect except that the former is more graphic,

¹ Somewhat less than one-third of the total (680) progressive cases.

² These cases are Ennius, Ann. 204, C. I. L. I. 201. 11 (3 cases), Varro, L. L. 5. 9 (1 case), and Auctor ad Herenn. I. I. 1 (2 cases), I. 10. 16, 2. I. 2, 2. 2. 2 (2 cases), 3. I. 1 (2 cases), 4. 34. 46, 4. 36. 48, 4. 37. 49. All of these are in passages of colloquial coloring, either in speeches or, especially those in auctor ad Herenn., in epistolary passages.

³ I use this term for all phases of the tense used for graphic purposes.

and if it were possible to separate in every instance these cases from those in which the imperfect may be said to have been required, we should have a criterion by which we might distinguish this use of the imperfect from others. But since the progressive function of the tense is not altered, such a distinction is not necessary.

Statistics as to the frequency of the imperfect of situation in early Latin are worth little because the chief remains of the language of that period are the dramatists in whom naturally the present is more important than the past. The historians, to whom we should look for the best illustrations of this usage, are for the most part preserved to us in brief fragments. Nevertheless an examination of the comparatively few descriptive passages in early Latin reveals several points of interest.

In Plautus and Terence the imperfect was not a favorite tense in descriptions. Bacch. 258-307, a long descriptive passage of nearly 50 lines, interrupted by unimportant questions, shows only 4 imperfects (1 aoristic) amid over 40 perfects, historical presents, &c. Capt. 497-515, Amph. 203-261, Bacch. 947-970, show but one case each. Stich. 539-554 shows 5 cases of *erat*. In Epid. 207-253 there are 10 cases.

In the descriptive passages of Terence the imperfect is still far from being a favorite tense, though relatively more common than in Plautus, cf. Andr. 48 ff., 74-102, Phorm. 65-135 (containing 11 imperfects). But Eunuch. 564-608 has only 4 and Heaut. 96-150 only 3.

Another very instructive passage is the well-known description by Q. Claudius Quadrigarius of the combat between Manlius and a Gaul (Peter, Hist. rom. fragg., p. 137, 10b). In this passage of 28 lines there are but 2 imperfects. The very similar passage describing the combat between Valerius and a Gaul and cited by Gellius (IX, 11) probably from the same Quadrigarius contains 8 imperfects in 24 lines. Since Gellius is obviously retelling the second story, the presumption is that the passage in its original form was similar in the matter of tenses to the passage about Manlius. In other words Gellius has 'edited' the story of Valerius, and one of his improvements consists in enlivening the tenses a bit. He describes the Manlius passage thus: *Q. Claudius primo annalium purissime atque illustrissime simplicique et incompta orationis antiquae suavitate descripsit*. This *simplex et incompta suavitas* is due in large measure to the fact that

Quadrigarius has used the simple perfect (19 times), varying it with but few (4) presents and imperfects (2). A closer comparison of the passage with the story of Valerius reveals the difference still more clearly. Quadrigarius uses (not counting subordinate clauses) 19 perfects, 4 presents, 2 imperfects; Gellius, 4 perfects, 9 presents, 8 imperfects. In several instances the same act is expressed by each with a different tense:

Quadrigarius.	Gellius.
<i>processit</i> (bis),	{ <i>procedebat</i> ,
	{ <i>progreditur</i> ,
<i>constitit</i> ,	{ <i>congregiuntur</i> ,
	{ <i>consistunt</i> ,
<i>constituerunt</i> ,	<i>conserebantur manus</i> ,
8 perfects of acts in	5 imperfects of acts
combat.	of the <i>corvus</i> .

Gellius has secured greater vividness at the expense of simplicity and directness.

This choice of tenses was, as has been said, a matter of art, whether conscious or unconscious. The earlier writers seem to have preferred on the whole the barer, simpler perfect even in passages which might seem to be especially adapted to the imperfect, historical present, &c. The perfect, of course, always remained far the commoner tense in narrative, and instances are not lacking in later times of passages¹ in which there is a striking preponderance of perfects. Nevertheless the imperfect, as the language developed, with the growth of the rhetorical tendency and a consequent desire for variety in artistic prose and poetry, seems to have come more and more into vogue.²

The fact that the function of a tense is often revealed, defined, and strengthened by the presence in the context of particles of various kinds, subordinate clauses, ablative absolutes, &c., &c.,

¹ E. g. Caesar, B. G. I. 55 and 124-5.

² The relative infrequency of the tense in early Latin was pointed out on p. 164. Its growth as a help in artistic prose is further proved by the fact that the fragments of the later and more rhetorical annalists, e. g. Quadrigarius, Sisenna, Tubero, show relatively many more cases than the earliest annalists. This is probably not accident. When compared with the history of the same phenomenon in Greek, where the imperfect, so common in Homer, gave way to the aorist, this increase in use in Latin may be viewed as a revival of a usage popular in Indo-European times. Cf. p. 185, n. 2.

was pointed out in *Trans. Am. Philol. Ass.* XXX, pp. 17 ff. What was there¹ said of Plautus and Terence may here be extended to the whole period of early Latin. The words and phrases used in this way are chiefly temporal. Some of those occurring most frequently are: *modo, commodum; tum, tunc; simul; dudum, iam dudum; iam, primo, primulum; nunc; ilico; olim, quondam; semper, saepe; fere, plerumque; ita,*² &c., &c. A rough count shows in this class about 120 cases,³ accompanied by one or more particles or expressions of this sort. Some merely date the tense, e. g., *tum, modo, dudum*, &c. Others, as *saepe, fere, primulum*, have a more intimate connection with the function. Naturally the effect of the latter group is clearest in the imperfects of customary past action, the frequentative, &c., and will be illustrated under those headings. Here I will notice only a few cases with *iam, primulum*, &c., which illustrate very well how close the relation between particle and tense may be. The most striking cases are:

Plautus, *Merc.* 43, *amare valide coepi[t] hic meretricem. ilico*

Res exulatum ad illam <c>lam abibat patris. Cf. Men. 1116, nam tunc dentes mihi cadebant primulum.

id. Merc. 197, *Equidem me iam censebam esse in terra atque in tuto loco:*

Verum video . . .

id. Cist. 566, *Iam perducebam illam ad me suadela mea,*

Anus ei <quom> amplexast genua . . .

id. Merc. 212, *credet hercle: nam credebat iam mihi.*

The unquestionably inceptive force of these cases arises from the combination of tense and particle. No inceptive⁴ function can be proved for the tense alone, for I find no cases with inceptive force unaccompanied by such a particle.

¹ Cf. also Morris, *Syntax*, p. 83.

² How far the nature of the clause in which it stands may influence the choice of a tense is a question needing investigation. That causal, explanatory, characterizing, and other similar clauses very often seem to require an imperfect is beyond question, but the proportion of imperfects to other tenses in such clauses is unknown. Cf. p. 166, n. 1.

³ No introductory conjunctions are included in this total, nor are other particles included, unless they are in immediate connection with the tense.

⁴ In *Trans. Am. Philolog. Ass.* XXX, p. 21, I was inclined to take at least *Merc.* 43 as inceptive. This I now believe to have been an error. The inceptive idea was most commonly expressed by *coepi* + *infin.* which is very common in Plautus and Varro. We have here the opposite of the phenomenon discussed on p. 177.

There are a few cases in which the imperfect produces the same effect as the imperfect of the so-called first periphrastic conjugation: Terence, Hec. 172, Interea in Imbro moritur cognatus senex.

Horunc: ea ad hos *redibat* lege hereditas.=reditura erat, English 'was coming', 'was about to revert', cf. Greek μέλλω with infinitive.

Cf. Phorm. 929, Nam non est aequum me propter vos decipi,
Quom ego vestri honoris causa repudium alterae
Remiserim, quae dotis tantundem *dabat*.=datura erat &c.

In these cases the really future event is conceived very vividly as already being realized.

Plautus, Amph. 597 seems to have the effect of the English 'could':

Neque . . . mihi *credebam* primo mihimet Sosiae
Donec Sosia . . . ille . . .

But the 'could' is probably inference from what is a very vivid statement. A Roman would probably not have felt such a shading.¹

I B. THE IMPERFECT OF CUSTOMARY PAST ACTION.

The imperfect may indicate some act or state at some appreciable distance in the past as customary, usual, habitual &c. The act or state must be at some appreciable distance in the past (and is usually at a great distance) because this function of the tense depends upon the contrast between past and present, a contrast so important that in a large proportion of the cases it is enforced by the use of particles.² The act (or state) is conceived as repeated at longer or shorter intervals, for an act does not become customary until it has been repeated. This customary act usually takes place also as a result or necessary concomitant of certain conditions expressed or implied in the context, e. g. *maiores nostri olim* &c., prepares us for a statement of what they used to do. The act may indeed be conceived as occurring only as a result of a certain expressed condition, e. g. Plautus, Men. 484 mulier quidquid dixerat,

¹ Some of the grammars recognize 'could' as a translation, e. g., A. & G. § 277 g.

² E. g. *tum, tunc, olim* &c. with the imperfect, and *nunc* &c. with the contrasted present.

Idem ego *dicebam* = my words would be uttered only as a result of hers.¹

There are 462 cases of the customary past usage of which 218 occur in independent sentences, 244 in dependent. This large total, more than one-third of all the cases, is due to the character of Varro's *De lingua latina* from which 289 cases come. This is veritably a 'customary past' treatise, for it is for the most part a discussion of the customs of the old Romans in matters pertaining to speech. Accordingly nearly all the imperfects fall under this head. Plautus and Terence furnish 112. The remaining 61 are pretty well scattered.

As illustrations of this usage I will cite (arranging the cases according to the classes of verbs):

I. 1. Plautus, Pseud. 1180, Noctu in vigiliam quando *ibat* miles, quom tu *ibas* simul,

Conveniebatne in vaginam tuam machaera militis?

Terence, Hec. 157, Ph. Quid? interea *ibatne* ad Bacchidem? Pa. Cottidie.

Varro, L. L. 5. 180, qui iudicio vicerat, suum sacramentum e sacro auferebat, victi ad aerarium *redibat*.

I. 2. Plautus, Bacch. 429, Saliendo sese *exercebant* magis quam scorto aut saviis. (cf. the whole passage).

Hist. fragg., p. 83. 27, Cn., inquit, Flavius, patre libertino natus, *scriptum faciebat* (occupation) isque in eo tempore aedili curuli apparebat, . . .

I. 3. Terence, Eun. 398, Vel rex semper maxumas

Mihi *agebat* quidquid feceram:

Varro, L. L., 5. 121, Mensa vinaria rotunda *nominabatur* Cilibantum ut etiam *nunc* in castris. Cf. L. L. 7. 36, *appellabant*,

5. 118, 5. 167 &c.

¹ This usage seemed to me formerly sufficiently distinct to deserve a special class and the name 'occasional', since it is occasioned by another act. It is at best, however, only a sub-class of the customary past usage and in the present paper I have not distinguished it in the tables. It is noteworthy that the act is here at its minimum as regards repetition and that it may occur in the immediate past, cf. Rud. 1226, whereas the customary past usage in its pure form is never used of the immediate past. The usages may be approximately distinguished in English by 'used to', 'were in the habit of' &c. (pure customary past), and 'would' (occasional), although 'would' is often a good rendering of the pure customary past. Good cases of the occasional usage are: Plautus, Merc. 216, 217; Poen. 478 ff; Terence, Hec. 804; Hist. fragg. p. 202. 9 (5 cases), *ibid.* p. 66. 128 (4 cases).

I. 4. Plautus, Bacch. 421, *Eadem ne erat haec disciplina tibi, quom tu adulescens eras?*

C. I. L. I. 1011.17 *Ille meo officio adsiduo florebat ad omnis.*

II. 1. Auctor ad Herenn. 4. 16. 23, *Maiores nostri si quam unius peccati mulierem damnabant, simplici iudicio multorum malefactorum convictam putabant. quo pacto? quam inpudicam iudicabant, ea venefici quoque damnata existimabatur.*

Cato, De ag., 1, *amplissime laudari existimabatur qui ita laudabatur.*

II. 2. Plautus, Epid. 135, *Illam amabam olim: nunc iam alia cura impendet pectori.*

Varro, R. R. III. 17.8, *etenim hac incuria laborare aiebat M. Lucullum ac piscinas eius despiciebat quod aestivaria idonea non haberent.*

III. 3. Plautus, As. 212, *quod nolebam ac votueram, de industria*

Fugiebatis neque conari id facere audebatis prius. Cf. the whole passage.

Varro, L. L. 5. 162, *ubi quid conditum esse volebant, a celando Cellam appellarunt.*

III. Terence, Phorm.¹ 90, *Tonstrina erat quaedam: hic solebamus fere*

Plerumque eam opperiri, . . .

Varro, L. L. 6. 8, *Solstitium quod sol eo die sistere videbatur . . .*

The influence of particles² and phrases in these cases is very marked. I count about 110 cases, more than $\frac{1}{4}$ of the total, with which one or more particles appear. Those expressions which emphasize the contrast are most common, e. g. *tum, olim, me puero* with the imperfect, and *nunc, iam* &c. with the contrasted present.

This class also affords excellent illustrations of the reciprocal influence of verb-meaning³ and tense-function. In Varro there are 50 cases, out of 289, of verbs of naming, calling, &c., which are by nature evidently adapted to the expression of the customary past. Such are *appellabam, nominabam, vocabam, vocitabam*, &c. But the most striking illustration is found in verbs of customary action, e. g. *soleo, adsuesco, consuesco*, which by their

¹ Cf. Trans. Am. Philolog. Ass. XXX, p. 19.

² Note as illustrations the italicized particles in the citations, pp. 175-6.

³ Cf. Morris, Syntax, p. 47, and p. 72, with note.

meaning possess already the function supplied to other verbs by the tense and context. When a verb of this class occurs in the imperfect of customary past the function is enhanced. Naturally, however, these verbs occur but rarely in the imperfect, for in any tense they express the customary past function.

It is interesting to note the struggle for existence between various expressions of the same thought. A Roman could express the customary past idea in several ways, of which the most noticeable are the imperfect tense, *soleo* or the like with an infinitive, or various periphrases such as *mos erat*. Of these possibilities all are rare save the first, the imperfect tense. There are but 12 cases of *soleo*, *consuesco*, &c., occurring in the imperfect indicative in early Latin. These are all cases of *solebam*, and 9 of them are imperfects of customary past action.¹ One would expect to find in common use the perfect of these verbs with an infinitive, but, although I have no exact statistics on this point, a pretty careful lookout has convinced me that such expressions are by no means common.² Periphrases with *mos*, *consuetudo*, &c., are also rare. Comparing these facts with the large number of cases in which the customary past function is expressed by the imperfect, we must conclude that this was the favorite mode of expression already firmly established in the earliest literature.³

I C. THE FREQUENTATIVE IMPERFECT.

In the proper context⁴ the imperfect may denote repeated or insistent action in the past. Although resembling the imperfect of customary past action, in which the act is also conceived as

¹ Terence, Phorm. 90; Varro, R. R. I. 2. 1, and II. 7. 1, L. L. 5. 126; Auctor ad Herenn. 4. 54. 67; Lucilius, IV. 2, &c.

² A collection of perfects covering 18 plays of Plautus shows but 15 cases of *solutus est*, *consuevit*, &c. My suspicion, based on Plautus and Terence, that these periphrases would prove common has thus been proven groundless.

³ The variation between imperfect and perfect is well illustrated by Varro, L. L. 5. 162, *ubi cenabant*, *cenaculum vocitabant*, and id. R. R. I. 17. 2, *iique quos obaeratos nostri vocitarunt*, where the frequentative verb expresses even in the perfect the customary past function.

For the variation between the customary past imperfect and the perfect of statement cf. Varro's L. L. almost anywhere, e. g. 5. 121, *mensa . . . rotunda nominabatur* Clibantum. 5. 36, *ab usu salvo saltus nominarunt*. So compare 5. 124 (*appellarunt*) with R. R. I. 2. 9 (*appellabant*). Cf. also L. L. 5. 35 *qua ibant . . . iter appellarunt*; *qua id auguste, semita, ut semiter dictum*.

⁴ Cf. Herbig, Aktionsart und Zeitstufe (I. F. 1896, § 59).

repeated, the frequentative usage differs in that there is no idea of habit or custom, and the act is depicted as repeated at intervals close together and without any conditioning circumstances or contrast with the present. I find only 13 cases of this usage, 7 of which are syntactically independent, 6 dependent. All occur in the first three classes of verbs. The cases are:

Plautus, Pers. 20, *miquidem tu iam eras mortuos, quia non visitabam.*

Ibid. 432, *id tibi suscensui,*

Quia te negabas credere argentum mihi.

Rud. 540, *Tibi auscultavi: tu promittebas mihi*

Illi esse quaestum maxumum meretricibus:

Capt. 917, *Aulas . . . omnis confregit nisi quae modiales erant:*

Cocum percontabatur, possentne seriae fervere:

As. 938, *Dicebam, pater, tibi ne matri consuleres male.* Cf.

Mil. Gl. 1410 (*dicebat*).

Truc. 506, *Quin ubi natust machaeram et clupeum*

poscebat sibi?

Epid. 59, *Quia cottidie ipse ad me ab legione epistulas*

Mittebat: cf. ibid. 132 (missiculabas).

Merc. 631, *Promittebas te os sublinere meo patri: ego me[t] credidi*

Homini docto rem mandar<e>, . . .

Ennius, Ann. 43, *haec ecfatu' pater, germana, repente recessit.*

*Nec sese dedit in conspectum corde cupitus,
quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa
tendebam lacrumans et blanda voce vocabam.*

Hist. fragg., p. 138. 11 (Q. Claudius Quadrigarius), *Ita per sexennium vagati Apuliam atque agrum quod his per militem licebat expoliabantur.*

This class is so small and many of the cases are so close to the simple progressive and the imperfect of situation that it is tempting to force the cases into those classes.¹ A careful con-

¹ How close the frequentative notion may be to the imperfect of the immediate past is well illustrated by As. 938 (cited above). In this case we have virtually an imperfect of the immediate past in which, however, the frequentative coloring predominates: *dicebam* means not 'I've been telling', but 'I've kept telling', &c. Cf. also Pseud. 422 (*dissimulabam*) for another case of the imperfect of the immediate past which is close to the frequentative. In its pure form, however, the frequentative imperfect does not hold in view the present.

sideration of each case has, however, convinced me that the frequentative function is here clearly predominant. In Plautus, Pers. 20, Epid. 131, Capt. 917, it is impossible to say how much of the frequentative force is due to the tense and how much to the form of the verbs themselves; both are factors in the effect. Verbs like *mitto*, *promitto*, *voco*, and even *dico*, are also obviously adapted to the expression of the frequentative function.

It is noteworthy that in this usage a certain emphasis is laid on the tense. In eight of the cases the verb occupies a very emphatic position, in verse often the first position in the line, cf. the definition on p. 177.

I D. THE CONATIVE IMPERFECT.

The imperfect may indicate action as attempted in the past. There must be something in the context, usually the immediate context, to show that the action of the verb is fruitless. There are no certain cases of this usage in early Latin. I cite the only instances, four in number, which may be interpreted as possibly conative:

Plautus, As. 931, Arg. Ego *dissuadebam*, mater. Art. Bellum
filium.

Id. Epid. 215, Tum meretricum numerus tantus quantum in
urbe omni fuit

Obviam ornatae occurrebant suis quaeque | amatoribus:

Eos *captabant*.

Auctor ad Herenn., 4. 55. 68, . . . cum pluribus aliis ire celerius
coepit. illi praeco *faciebat* audientiam; hic subsellium, quod
erat in foro, calce premens dextera pedem defringit et . . .

Hist. fragg., p. 143. 46, Fabius de nocte coepit hostibus castra
simulare oppugnare, eum hostem delectare, dum collega id
caperet quod *captabat*.

But in the second and fourth cases the verb *capto* itself means to 'strive to take', 'to catch at' &c., and none of the conative force can with certainty be ascribed to the tense. In the first case, again, the verb *dissuadebam* means 'to advise against', not 'to succeed in advising against' (dissuade). Argyrippus says: 'I've been advising against his course, mother', not 'I've been trying, or I tried, to dissuade him'. The imperfect is, therefore, of the common immediate past variety.¹

¹ Cf. a few lines below (938) *dicebam*.

In Auct. ad Herenn., 4. 55. 68, the imperfect is part of the very vivid description of the scene attending the death of Tiberius Gracchus. Indeed the whole passage is an illustration of *demonstratio* or vivid description which the author has just defined. The acts of Gracchus and his followers are balanced against those of the fanatical optimates under Scipio Nasica: 'While the herald was silencing¹ the murmurs in the *contio*, Scipio was arming himself' &c. Though it may be true that the act indicated by *faciebat audientiam* was not accomplished, this seems a remote inference and one that cannot be proved from the context.

If my interpretation of these cases is correct, there are no certain² instances of the conative imperfect in early Latin.

There is but one case of *conabar* (Terence, Phorm. 52) and one of *templabam* (Plautus, Mil. gl. 1336). Both of these belong to the immediate past class, the conative idea being wholly in the verb.

II. THE AORISTIC IMPERFECT.

The imperfect of certain verbs may indicate an act or state as merely past without any idea of progression. In this usage the kind of action reaches a vanishing point and only the temporal element of the tense remains. The imperfect becomes a mere preterite, cf. the Greek aorist and the Latin aoristic perfect. The verbs to which this use of the imperfect is restricted are, in early Latin, two verbs of saying, *aio* and *dico*, and the verb *sum* with its compounds.

There are 56 cases of the aoristic imperfect in early Latin (see Table II), 48 of which occur in syntactically independent sentences. Some citations follow:

Plautus, Bacch. 268, Quotque innocenti ei dixit contumelias.

Adulterare eum *aibat* rebus ceteris.

Id. Most. 1027, Te velle uxorem *aiebat* tuo gnato dare:

Ideo aedificare hoc velle *aiebat* in tuis.

Th. Hic aedificare volui? Si. Sic dixit mihi.

Id. Poen. 900, Et ille qui eas vendebat dixit se furtivas vendere:

Ingenuas Carthagine *aibat* esse.

¹ *Faciebat audientiam* seems a technical expression, cf. lexicon.

² The case cited by Gildersleeve-Lodge, § 233, from Auct. ad Herenn., 2. 1. 2, *ostendebatur* seems to me a simple imperfect and there is nothing in the context to prove a conative force, cf. 3. 15. 26 *demonstrabatur*.

In these cases note the parallel cases of *dixit*, cf. id. Trin. 1140, Men. 1141 &c., &c.

I note but three cases of *dicebam*:

Terence, Eun. 701, Ph. Unde [igitur] fratrem meum esse scibas? Do. Parmeno

Dicebat eum esse. Cf. Plautus, Epid. 598 for a perfect used like this.

Varro, R. R. II. 4. 11, In Hispania ulteriore in Lusitania [ulteriore] sus cum esset occisus, Atilius Hispaniensis minime mendax et multarum rerum peritus in doctrina, *dicebat* L. Volumnio senatori missam esse offulam cum duabus costis . . .

Ibid. III. 17. 4, pisces . . . quos sacrificanti tibi, Varro, ad tibicinem [graecum] gregatim venisse *dicebas* ad extremum litus atque aram, quod eos capere auderet nemo, . . .

In these cases the verb *dico* becomes as vague as is *aio* in the preceding citations.

Plautus, Poen. 1069, Nam mihi sobrina Ampsigura tua mater fuit,

Pater tuos is *erat* frater patruelis meus,
Et is me heredem fecit, . . .

Id. Mil. gl. 1430, Nam illic qui | ob oculum habebat lanam
nauta non *erat*.

Py. Quis *erat* igitur? Sc. Philocomasio amator.

Id. Amph. 1009, Naucratem quem convenire volui in navi
non *erat*,

Neque domi neque in urbe invenio quemquam qui illum
viderit.¹

Id. Merc. 45, Leno inportunus, dominus eius mulieris,

Vi sum <m>a[t] quicque ut *poterat* rapiebat domum.

In such cases as the last the imperfect has become formulaic, cf. quam maxime *poterat*, &c.

¹ Rodenbusch, pp. 8-10, after asserting that the imperfect of verbs of saying and the like is used in *narratio* like the perfect (aorist), cites a number of illustrations in which (he adds) the imperfect force may still be felt! But a case in which the imperfect force may still be felt does not illustrate the imperfect in simple past statements, if that is what is meant by *narratio*. Only four of R.'s citations are preterital (aoristic), and these are all cases of *aibam* (Plautus, Amph. 807, As. 208, 442, Most. 1002). The same may be said of the citations on p. 9, of which only Eun. 701 is aoristic. J. Schneider (De temporum apud priscos latinos usu quaestiones selectae, program, Glatz, 1888) recognizes the aoristic use of *aibat*, but his statement that the comic poets used perfect and imperfect indiscriminately as aorists cannot be accepted.

III. THE SHIFTED IMPERFECT.

In a few cases the imperfect appears shifted from its function as a tense of the past, and is equivalent to (1) a mere present; or (2) an imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive.

The cases equivalent to a present¹ are all in Varro, L. L., and are restricted to verbs of obligation (*oportebat, debebat*): L. L. 8. 74, neque *oportebat* consuetudinem notare alios dicere Boum greges, alios Boverum, et signa alios Iovum, alios Ioverum.

Ibid. 8. 47, Nempe esse *oportebat* vocis formas ternas ut in hoc Humanus, Humana, Humanum, sed habent quaedam binas . . .

ibid. 9. 85, si esset denarii in recto casu atque infinitam multitudinem significaret, tunc in patrico denariorum dici *oportebat*.

Ibid. 8. 65, Sic Graeci nostra senis casibus [quinis non] dicere *debebant*, quod cum non faciunt, non est analogia.²

The cases equivalent to the subjunctive are confined to *sat* &c. + *erat* (6 cases), *poteram* (3 cases), *decebat* (1 case), and *sequebatur* (1 case). As illustrations may be cited:

Plautus, Mil. gl. 755, Insanivisti hercle: nam idem hoc hominibus *sat* [a] *era*[n]t decem.

Auct. ad Herenn. 2. 22. 34, nam hic *satis erat* dicere, si id modo quod esset satis, curarent poetae. = 'would have been,' cf. ibid. 4. 16. 23 (*iniquom erat*),

Plautus, Mil. gl. 911, Bonus vates *poteras* esse: = 'might be' or 'might have been'.

Id. Merc. 983 b, Vacuum esse istac ted aetate his *decebat* noxiis.

Eu. Itidem ut tempus anni, aetate <m> aliam aliud factum condecet.

Varro, L. L. 9. 23, si enim usquequaque non esset analogia, tum *sequebatur* ut in verbis quoque non esset, non, cum esset usquequaque, ut est, non esse in verbis . . . This is a very odd case and I can find no parallel for it.³

¹ Varro uses the perfect also of these verbs as equivalent to the present of general statements. Cf. L. L. 8, §§ 72-74, where *debuit* occurs 4 times as equivalent to *debet*, § 48 (*debuerunt* twice), § 50 (*oportuit* = *oportet*). The perfect infinitive is equivalent to the present, e. g. in 8, § 61 and § 66 (*debuisse* . . . *dici*). The tenses are of very little importance in such verbs.

² Note the presents expressed in the second and fourth citations.

³ The remaining cases are: Plautus, Truc. 511 (*poterat*), id. Rud. 269 (*aequius erat*), Lucilius, Sat. 5. 47 M. (*sat erat*), Auctor ad Herenn. 4. 16. 23 (*iniquom erat*), ibid. 4. 41. 53 (quae separatim dictae . . . *infimae erant*).

TABLE I.
AUTHORS AND FUNCTIONS.

	Total.	I. True Imperfect.			II. Aoristic.	III. Shifted.
		A. Progressive.	B. Cust. Past.	C. Frequent.		
Plautus.....	427	287	84	10	41	5
Terence.. ...	226	187	28		10	1
Cato ¹	24	2	22			
Dramatists ² ..	69	60	7	2		
Historians....	52	34	16	1	1	
Orators.....	12	9	3			
Lucilius.....	13	11	1			1
Auctor ad Her.	79	63	11		2	3
Inscriptions..	4	3	1			
Varro....	320	24	289		2	5
	1226	680	462	13	56	15

¹ The fragments of Cato's historical work are included in the historians.² Including the epic fragments of Ennius and Naevius.TABLE II.
VERBS AND FUNCTIONS.

Classes of Verbs.	Total Cases.	I. True Imperfect.						II. Aoristic.		III. Shifted.	
		A. Progressive.		B. Cust. Past.		C. Frequent.					
		Ind.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.
I. Physical.											
1. Motion.....	85	40	17	9	17		1			1	
2. Action.....	302	96	45	75	82	1	3				
3. Verbal commun.	233	46	26	64	46	6	2	38	5		
4. Rest, state, &c.. (<i>eram</i> 220)	346	138	69	48	75			10		4	2
II. Psychical.											
1. Thought.....	91	46	25	13	7						
2. Feeling.....	90	53	30	6	1						
3. Will.....	19	9	7		3						
III. Auxiliaries.	60	21	12	3	13				3	7	1
	1226	449	231	218	244	7	6	48	8	12	3
			449		218		7		48		12
			680		462		13		56		15

3. HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL.

The original function of the imperfect seems to have been to indicate action as progressing in the past, the simple progressive imperfect. This is made probable, in the first place, by the fact that this usage is more common than all others combined, including, as it does, 680 out of a total of 1226 cases. This proportion is reduced, as we should remember, by the peculiar character of the literature under examination, which contains relatively so little narrative, and especially by the nature of Varro's *De lingua latina* in which the cases are chiefly of the customary past variety.¹ Moreover, the customary past usage itself, and also the frequentative and the conative, are to be regarded as offshoots of the progressive usage of which they still retain abundant traces, so that if we include in our figures all the classes in which a trace of the progressive function remains we shall find that 1155 of 1226 cases are true imperfects (see table II).

Another support for the view that the progressive function is original may be drawn from the probable derivation of the tense. Stolz² (after Thurneysen) derives the imperfect from the infinitive in *-ē* and an old aorist of the root **bhu*. The idea of progression was thus originally inherent in the ending *-bam*.

Let us now establish as far as possible the relations subsisting between the various uses of the true imperfect (IA, B, C, D), turning our attention first to the simple progressive (IA) and its variations.

The relation between the progressive imperfect in its pure form and the usage which has been named the imperfect of the immediate past is not far to seek. The progressive function remains essentially unchanged. The only difference lies in the extension of the time up to the immediate past (or present) in the case of the immediate past usage. The transition between: *ibat exulatum*³ = 'he was going into exile' (when

¹ See p. 175.

² In I. Müller's *Handb. d. kl. Alt. II.*,² § 113, p. 376. Lindsay, *Latin Lang.*, pp. 489-490, emphasizes the nominal character of the first element in the compound, and suggests a possible I. E. **-bhwām*, *-ās*, &c., as antecedent of Latin *-bam*, *-bās*, *-bat*. He also compares very interestingly the formation of the imperfect in Slavonic, which is exactly analogous to this inferred Latin formation, except that the ending comes from a different root.

³ Cf. Plautus, *Merc.* 981.

I saw him at a more or less definite
point in the past)
and *ibat exulatum* = 'he was going (has been going)
into exile' (but we have just met him)

is plain enough. The difference is one of context. In this imperfect of the immediate past the Romans possessed a substitute for our English compound perfect tense, 'have been doing', &c.¹

In the imperfect of situation also the function of the tense is not altered. The tense is merely applied in a different way, its progressive function adapted to vivid description, and we have found it already in the earliest² literature put to this use. In its extreme form it occurs in passages which would seem to require nothing more graphic than a perfect. Indeed, we must guard against the view that the imperfect is a stronger tense than the perfect; it is as strong, but in a different way, and while the earlier writers preferred in general the perfect,³ the imperfect grew gradually in favor until in the period marked by the highest development of style the highest art consisted in a happy combination⁴ of the two.

The imperfect of customary past action is, as we have seen, already well established in the earliest literature. A glance at Table I would seem to show that it grew to sudden prominence in Varro, but the peculiar nature of Varro's work has already been pointed out, so that the apparent discrepancy between the proportion of cases in Varro and in Plautus and Terence, for instance, means little. It should be remembered also that this discrepancy is still further increased by the nature of the drama, whose action lies chiefly in the present. While, therefore, in Plautus and Terence the proportion of customary pasts is $\frac{1}{2}$,

¹ Latin also exhibits some similar compounds, cf. Plautus, Capt. 925, *te carens dum hic fui*, Poen. 1038, *ut tu sis sciens*, and Terence, Andr. 508, *ut sis sciens*. Cf. Schmalz in I. Müller's Handb. II², p. 399.

² In the Greek literature, which begins not only absolutely but relatively much earlier than the Latin, the imperfect was used to narrate and describe, and Brugmann, indeed, considers this a use which goes back to Indo-European times. Later the imperfect was crowded out to a great extent by the aorist, as in Latin by the (aoristic) perfect. Cf. Brugmann in I. Müller's Handb. II, ² p. 183.

³ Cf. p. 171.

⁴ The power of the perfect lies in its simplicity, but when too much used this degenerates into monotony and baldness.

and in Varro $\frac{5}{8}$, the historians with $\frac{1}{2}$ probably present a juster average.

The relation of this usage to the simple progressive imperfect has already been pointed out,¹ but must be repeated here for the sake of completeness. If we inject into a sentence containing a simple progressive imperfect a strong temporal contrast, e. g., if *facit, sed non faciebat* becomes *nunc facit, olim autem non faciebat*, it is at once evident how the customary past usage has developed. It has been grafted on the tense by the use of such particles and phrases, expressions which were in early Latin still so necessary that they were expressed in more than one-quarter of the cases; or, in other words, it is the outgrowth of certain oft-recurring contexts, and is still largely dependent on the context for its full effect. Transitional cases in which the temporal contrast is to be found, but no customary past coloring, may be cited from Plautus, Rud. 1123, *Dudum dimidiam petebas partum*. Tr. *Immo etiam nunc peto*. Here the action expressed by *petebas* is too recent to acquire the customary past notion.² The progressive function caused the imperfect to lend itself more naturally than other tenses³ to the expression of this idea.⁴

Although the customary past usage was well established in the language at the period of the earliest literature, and we cannot actually trace its inception and development, I am convinced that it was a relatively late use of the tense by the mere fact that the language possesses such verbs as *soleo, consuesco*, &c., and that even as late as the period of early Latin the function seemed to need definition, cf. the frequent use of particles, &c.

The small number of cases (13) which may be termed frequentative indicates that this function is at once rare and in its infancy in the period of early Latin. The frequentative function is so closely related⁵ to the progressive that it is but a slight step from

¹ Trans. Am. Philolog. Ass., Vol. XXX, pp. 18-20.

² Cf. Men. 729.

³ How strong the effect of particles on other tenses may be is to be seen in such cases as Turpilius, p. 113. I (Ribbeck), *Quem olim oderat, sectabat ultro ac detinet*.

⁴ The process was therefore analogous to that which can be actually traced in cases of the frequentative and conative uses.

⁵ Terence, Adel. 332-3, affords a good transitional case: *iurabat . . . dicebat* = (almost) 'kept swearing' . . . 'kept saying' &c., cf. p. 47 n. 1. It should

the latter to the former. Latin¹ seems, however, to have been unwilling to take that step. The vast number of frequentative,² desiderative and other secondary endings also prove that the tense was not the favorite means for the expression of the frequentative idea. Nevertheless since the progressive and frequentative notions are so closely related and since frequentative verbs must again and again have been used in the imperfect subject to the influence of the progressive function of particles such as *saepe*, *etiam atque etiam*, and since finally a simple verb must often have appeared in similar situations, e. g. *poscebat* for *poscitabat*, the tense inevitably acquired at times the frequentative function. We have here, therefore, an excellent illustration of the process by which a secondary function may be grafted on a tense and the frequentative function is dependent to a greater degree than the customary past upon the influence and aid of the context. That it is of later origin is proved by its far greater rarity (see Table II).

If the frequentative imperfect in early Latin is still in its infancy, the conative usage is merely foreshadowed. The fact that there are no certain instances proves that relatively too much importance, at least for early Latin, has been assigned to the conative imperfect by the grammars. Statistics would probably prove it rare at all periods, periphrases with *conor* &c., having sufficed for the expression of the conative function.

The most powerful influence in moulding tense functions is context.³ In the case of the conative function this becomes all powerful for we must be able to infer from the context that the act indicated by the tense has not been accomplished. The

also be pointed out that the frequentative imperfect is very closely related to the imperfect of situation. To conceive an act as frequentative necessarily implies a vivid picture of it. (Cf. next note). It is possible, therefore, to interpret as vivid imperfects of situation such cases as Ennius, Ann. 43-4; Plautus, Truc. 506, Capt. 917, but a careful study of these has convinced me that the frequentative idea predominates.

¹ In Greek, however, the imperfect was commonly used with an idea of repetition in the proper context. This use is correctly attributed by Brugmann (I. Müller's Handb. &c. II,² p. 184) to the similarity between the progressive and frequentative ideas as well as to the fondness for description of a repeated act.

² Acc. to Herbig, § 62 (after Garland?) there were probably no iterative formations in Indo-European.

³ Cf. Morris, Syntax, pp. 46, 82, &c.

function thus rests upon inference from the context. The presence in the language of the verbs *conor*, *tempto*, &c., proves that the conative function, like the frequentative, was a secondary growth grafted on the tense in similar fashion, but at a later period, for we have no certain instances in early Latin. This function of the imperfect certainly originates within the period of the written language.

The fact that the preponderance of the aoristic cases occurs in Plautus and Terence (see Table I) indicates that this usage was rather colloquial. This is further supported by the fact that the majority of the cases are instances of *aibam*, a colloquial verb, and of *eram* which in popular language would naturally be confused with *fui*. In this usage, therefore, we have an instance of the colloquial weakening of a function through excessive use in certain situations, a phenomenon which is common in secondary formations, e. g. diminutives. The aoristic function is not original, but originated in the progressive usage and in that application of the progressive usage which is called the imperfect of situation. Chosen originally for graphic effect the tense was used in similar contexts so often that it lost all of this force. All the cases of *aibam*, for instance, are accompanied by an indirect discourse either expressed (38 cases) or understood (2 cases). The statement contained in the indirect discourse is the important thing and *aibam* became a colorless introductory (or inserted) formula losing all tense force.¹ If this was the case with the verb which, in colloquial Latin at least, was preeminently the mark of the indirect discourse it is natural that by analogy *dicebam*, when similarly employed, should have followed suit.²

With *eram* the development was similar. The loss of true imperfect force, always weak in such a verb, was undoubtedly due

¹ Cf. Greek *ἔλεγε, ἣν δ' ἐγώ* &c. and English (vulgar) 'sez I' &c., (graphic present). Brugmann (I. Müller's Handb. &c. II,² p. 183) denies that the Greek imperfect ever *in itself* denotes completion, but he cites no cases of verbs of saying. Although one might say that the tense does not denote completion, yet if there was so little difference between imperfect and aorist that in Homer metrical considerations (always a doubtful explanation) decided between them (cf. Brugmann, *ibid.*), Brugmann seems to go too far in discovering any imperfect force in his examples. The two tenses were, in such cases, practical equivalents and both were colorless pasts.

² Rodenbusch, p. 8, assigns as a cause for the frequency of *aibat* in this use the impossibility of telling whether *aist* was present or perfect. This seems improbable.

to the vague meaning of the verb itself. Indeed it seems probable that *eram* is thus but repeating a process through which the lost imperfect of the root **fu*¹ must have passed. This lost imperfect was doubtless crowded out² by the (originally) more vivid *eram* which in turn has in some instances lost its force.

If the aoristic usage is not original, but the product of a colloquial weakening, we should be able to point out some transitional cases and I believe that I can cite several of this character:

Plautus, *Mere.* 190, *Eho . . . quin cavisti ne eam videret . . .?*

Quin, sceleste, <eam> abstrudebas, ne eam conspiceret pater?

Id. Epid. 597, *Quid, ob eam rem | hanc emisti, quia tuam gnatam es ratus?*

*Quibus de signis agnoscebas? Pe. Nullis. Phi. Qua re filiam Credidisti nostram?*³

In these cases the tense is apparently used for vivid effect (imperfect of situation), but it is evident that the progressive function is strained and that if these same verbs were used constantly in such connections, all real imperfect force would in time be lost. This is exactly what has occurred with *aibam*, *dicebam*, and *eram*. The progressive function if employed in this violent fashion simply to give color to a statement, when the verbs themselves (*aibam*, *dicebam*) do not contain the statement or are vague (*eram*), must eventually become worn out just as the diminutive meaning has been worn out of many diminutive endings.

In the shifted cases also the tense is wrenched from its proper sphere. But whereas the aoristic usage displays the tense stripped of its main characteristic, the progressive function, though still in possession of its temporal element as a tense of the past, in the shifted cases both progressive function and past time (in some instances) are taken from the tense. In those cases where the temporal element is not absolutely taken away it becomes very unimportant. This phenomenon is apparently due in the first place to the contrary-to-fact idea which is present in the context of each case, and secondly to the meaning of some of the verbs involved. In many of the cases these two reasons

¹ There was no present of this root acc. to Morris, *Syntax*, p. 56, but cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, p. 490.

² Also if **bhvām <-bam* was derived from **bhu <fu-* in *fui* &c., then the fact that it was assuming a new function in composition would help to drive it out of use as an independent form, *eram* (originally **ēsom*) taking its place.

³ Cf. Terence, *Phorm.* 298; *Adel.* 809, *Eun.* 700. Ennius, *Fab.* 339.

are merged into one, for the verbs themselves imply a contrary-to-fact notion, e. g. *debebat*, *oportebat*, *poterat* (the last when representing the English *might, could, &c.*). In Varro, L. L. 8. 65 the phrase *sic Graeci . . . dicere debebant* implies that the Greeks do not really so speak; so Plautus, Mil. gl., 911 *Bonus vates poteras esse* implies that the person addressed is not a *bonus vates*. In these peculiar verbs, which in recognition of their chief function I have classified as auxiliary verbs,¹ verb-meaning coincides very closely with mode, just as in *soleo*, *conor*, &c., verb-meaning coincides closely with tense. The modal idea is all important, all other elements sink into insignificance, and the force of the tense naturally becomes elusive.²

Let us summarize the probable history of the imperfect in early Latin. The simple, progressive imperfect represents the earliest, probably the original, usage. Of the variations of this simple usage the imperfect of the immediate past and the imperfect of situation are most closely related to the parent use. Both of these are early variants, the latter probably Indo-European,³ and both may be termed rather applications of the progressive function than distinct uses, since the essence of the tense remains unchanged, the immediate past usage arising from a widening of the temporal element, the imperfect of situation from a wider application of the progressive quality. Later than these two variants, but perhaps still pre-literary, arose the customary past usage, the first of the wider variations from the simple progressive. This was due to the application of the tense to customary past actions, aided by the contrast between past and present. Later still and practically within the period of the earliest literature was developed the frequentative usage, due chiefly to the close resemblance between the progressive and frequentative ideas and the consequent transfer of the frequentative function to the tense. Finally appears the conative use, only foreshadowed in early Latin, its real growth falling, so far as the remains of the language permit us to infer, well within the

¹ Cf. Whitney, German Grammar, § 242. 1.

² The same power of verb-meaning has shifted, e. g., the English *ought* from a past to a present. Cf. *ëder*, &c. If I understand Tobler, Uebergang zwischen Tempus und Modus (Z. f. Völkerpsych., &c., II. 47), he also considers the imperfect in such verbs as due to the peculiar meaning of the verbs themselves. Cf. Blase, Gesch. des Plusquamperfekts, § 3.

³ Cf. note.

Ciceronian period. In all these uses the progressive function is more or less clearly felt, and all alike require the influence of context to bring out clearly the additional notion connected with the tense.

The first real alteration in the essence of the tense appears in the aoristic usage in which the tense lost its progressive function and became a simple preterite. This usage, due to colloquial weakening, is confined in early Latin to three verbs, *aibam*, *dicebam*, and *eram* (with compounds). It is very early, pre-literary in fact, but later than the imperfect of situation, from which it seems to have arisen. A still greater loss of the essential features of the tense is to be seen in the shifted cases in which the temporal element, as well as the progressive, has become insignificant. This complete wrenching of the tense from its proper sphere is confined to a limited number of verbs and some phrases with *eram*, and is due to the influence of the pervading contrary-to-fact coloring often in combination with the meaning of the verb involved.

ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER.

IV.—THE VOCATIVE IN HOMER AND HESIOD.

The vocative is used in the Iliad with ὦ 73 times, without ὦ 628 times. The vocative is used in the Odyssey with ὦ 103 times, without ὦ 515 times. [Such a group of vocatives as the following, ὦ φίλοι, Ἀργείων ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες, is counted as but one.] The vocative, when used in prayer or in an address to a deity, never takes ὦ, and no mortal ever uses it in speaking to a god, known to be a god. Odysseus twice addresses the interjection to Athene, vii, 22, ὦ τέκος, and xiii, 228, ὦ φίλ'; but Athene is disguised in the former case as a maiden, in the latter as a young shepherd. Priam in XXIV, 425, addresses ὦ τέκος to Hermes, who is in the form of a young man.

Athene uses the interjection in speaking to Zeus, but only in excitement, impatience, or anger, using this verse, i, 45, 81. xxiv, 473. VIII, 31. ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὕπατε κρείοντων.

The words are changed a little in XXII, 178, but the tone is of great impatience.

Ares once addresses the interjection to Athene, using the highly insulting expression: ὦ κυνάνια, XXI, 394.

The entire absence of the interjection from a much used sphere of language must be due to the tone of ὦ and not to the metre. Metrical reasons cannot explain the omission of the following phrases: ὦ Ζεῦ, ὦ θεοί, ὦ Κρονίδη, ὦ Δωδωναί', ὦ θύγατερ Διός, ὦ Μοῦσαι, ὦ γαίῳχε κυανοχαῖτα, ὦ Θέμι, ὦ Φοῖβ', ὦ ἐκάεργε, ὦ Θέτι. All of these expressions are so well suited to the metre that the tone of the interjection alone explains their complete absence.

Any name of a god used in Homer could be used with ὦ by inserting an adjective or shifting the order. The interjection was omitted, as too familiar to be used in elevated, sacred, or religious expressions.

The interjection is never added directly to a patronymic in the Iliad, and but twice in the Odyssey; xxii, 287, ὦ Πολυθερσείδη φιλοκέρτομε, said in anger [hardly to be classed as a patronymic, except in form], and xxiv, 517, where Athene said in pity to Laertes, ὦ Ἀρκησιόδη. Neither of these conveys the patronymic tone of dignity or honor. In but three other phrases is the

interjection even remotely connected with a patronymic; III, 182, ὦ μάκαρ Ἀτρεΐδῃ, Priam thus speaks of the absent Agamemnon. A more familiar address can be applied to an absent ruler or leader than would be permissible in his presence. [The only time Agamemnon in person is addressed with the interjection is I, 158, where Achilles uses the angry, ὦ μέγ' ἀνειδές.] In the impatient expression used by Athene, ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε, Κρονίδῃ, Κρονίδῃ is used as metrical ballast. And in the third phrase, ὦ Νέστορ Νηληϊάδῃ, Νηληϊάδῃ is added rather to complete the verse than to confer dignity. Homer does not take Nestor very seriously, as the long inopportune speeches show, but especially the comic mockery of VIII, 78 ff.

Νέστορ οἷος ἔμιμνε Γερήνιος, οὖρος Ἀχαιῶν,
οὐ τι ἐκῶν, ἀλλ' ἵππος ἐτείρετο, τὸν βάλεν ἰφί
δίος Ἀλέξανδρος.

The practical absence of the interjection from such a large and much used class of words is not a matter of metre, as the following phrases show, each of which would perfectly fit the rhythm:

ὦ Λαερτιάδῃ, ὦ Τελαμωνιάδῃ, ὦ Πηληϊάδῃ, ὦ Καπανηϊάδῃ, ὦ Νηληϊάδῃ,
ὦ Κρονίδῃ, ὦ Τυδεΐδῃ, —, — υ υ —

ὦ Λαερτιάδῃ is in particular recommended by the rhythm, as it would give a caesura in the third foot, which is lacking in the recurring verse, διογενὲς Λαερτιάδῃ, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεύ.

Here, as in the preceding class, the interjection is omitted because of its familiar tone.

Exactly in keeping with this is the fact that no woman uses the interjection in either poem. Woman's attitude was too reserved. It is hardly an exception, that female slaves said to Odysseus, vii, 342, ὦ ξείνε.

The poet, in speaking in his own person in addresses to the muse, Menelaus, Patroclus, Melanippus, or Eumaeus never uses ὦ.

The interjection is used in none of the following reserved or dignified scenes; Parting of Hector and Andromache, Visit of Thetis to Hephaestus (vocative is found 19 times in XVIII, always without ὦ), Duel between Hector and Achilles, Priam's visit to the tent of Achilles, Scenes between Hermes and Calypso, and between Calypso and Odysseus, The Nausicaa,

and the arrival and reception of Odysseus at the palace of Alcinous. Books v-vii have 75 vocatives, and but three interjections; vii, 22, Odysseus says ω *τέκος* in asking the way; vii, 342, servants say to Odysseus ω *ξείνε*, and viii, 408, Euryalus uses the same expression. Iliad, XXIV, furnishes a good illustration of the tone of the interjection. When Priam meets Hermes disguised as a young man ω is freely spoken, 411, 425, 460; but as soon as Priam enters the presence of Achilles, this familiar tone ceases, and although 16 vocatives are used, ω is used with none of them. Of the 73 examples of ω in the Iliad, *φίλοι*, a word of familiarity, is used 21 times, and *πέπον*, a word of familiarity or impatience, is used 9 times.

Of the remaining, 17 are in marked anger or impatience, I, 158, II, 796, IV, 338, V, 464, VI, 164, VIII, 31, XI, 430, 450, XII, 409, XIII, 222, XIV, 104, XVI, 422, XIX, 216, XXI, 214, 394, XXII, 178, XXIII, 543. And 11 are very familiar, IV, 169, 189, X, 43, XVI, 21, XXIII, 19, 179, XXIV, 300, 411, 425, 460, 683.

All the remaining, except four, belong to the familiar greeting of one Greek warrior by another. There is nothing in the context which prevents familiarity in the address of Antenor to Helen, ω *γύναι*, III, 204, or in the ω *μάκαρ Ἀτρεΐδῃ*, III, 182, of Priam.

In Odysseus' address, ω *Χρύση*, I, 442, we have no way of determining the relation of Odysseus to the priest; but it is hardly an exception to the Homeric usage, and may reveal an intimacy which accounts for Odysseus being chosen to restore the maiden.

The only remaining example is where Calchas uses ω *Ἀχιλλεύ*, I, 74. The fact that the seer had such confidence in Achilles, that trusting in him he dared thwart Agamemnon, and the use of this familiar interjection, may argue an intimacy which increased the rage of Agamemnon.

The more familiar tone of the Odyssey gives a freer use of the interjection, so that while in the Iliad but one vocative in ten had ω , one in six has it in the Odyssey. The tone is, however, the same.

The familiar tone of the interjection fits it for such scenes as those in the palace of Nestor, and of Menelaus, or of Circe, the hut of Eumaeus, or where Odysseus returns in the guise of a beggar. As in the Iliad, the favorite word with ω is *φίλοι*, occurring 34 times. The first three vocatives used by the Cyclops have the interjection. [Thersites speaks but once in

the Iliad, but he uses the interjection, while Hector, in all his speaking, never uses it.]

No scene in Homer has so many examples of α as that in the hut of the swineherd, α occurring 8 times in 86 verses, xiv, 80-166.

It is exactly characteristic of the attitude of Odysseus, and the impression he tried to make, that in the presence of Nausicaa and Alcinous, as told in vi, vii, viii, he never uses α . In those scenes he wishes to appear worthy and dignified. On his return to Ithaca he tries to be mean and ignoble, and so he uses freely the interjection. He uses six vocatives, each with α , in xix, 107-382.

In the Odyssey as in the Iliad, in scenes of worship or elevation, the interjection α is never used. [Quintus Smyrnaeus using the same metre as Homer, and almost the same proper names, shows how easily, when the feeling for the interjection had changed, it can be used in hexameter. In less than 125 vocatives he has the interjection 70 times.]

HESIOD.

In Hesiod, as in Homer, no man ever addresses the interjection to a god. Hesiod never uses α except in cases of marked impatience or familiarity.

Theogony. Vocative with α twice, without 12 times. Zeus twice in great impatience addresses α $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\nu$ to Prometheus, 544, 560.

Shield. Vocative with α 4 times, without 4 times. Of the four times used, three are familiar, and one is in anger: familiar, 78, 95, 118; anger, 357.

Works and Days. Vocative with α 6 times, without 7 times. All of the six times used denote impatience or anger. α $\Pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta$. 27, 213, 274, 611, 641; α $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\eta\epsilon\varsigma$, 248, said to the unjust judges.

In every place in Hesiod, where the interjection is used it is clearly a sign of familiarity or impatience, and no example admits any other explanation.

CONCLUSION.

In early Epic the vocative is regularly used without α . When used, α denotes a throwing off of reserve. The throwing off of reserve gives it a familiar tone, which often becomes angry,

coarse, or impatient. Hence ω is never found in prayer or addresses to the gods, and is entirely absent in passages of dignity and elevation.¹

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.

¹ The $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ of ω had so completely changed in Attic prose that it was seldom omitted, and the vocative without the interjection had a familiar tone.

On the use in Attic prose, and especially in the Orators, see Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek*, 15 ff.; Rehdantz, *Index to Demosthenes*, under *Anrede*; Rockel, *De Allocutionis Usu*, Koenigsberg, 1884.

V.—THE VOCATIVE IN APOLLONIOS RHODIOS.

The serene atmosphere of the epos is not favorable to the true interjection. δ δειλ' is found in Homer but there is no αλαϊ, no φευ, no οτοτοϊ. δ is found in δ μοι and in δ πόποι but there is no οἶμοι, and now, according to Professor SCOTT, even the mild δ is excluded from the *quietis ordinibus deorum*. This exclusion, this *taboo*, seems to be an inheritance from the dactylic measures of hieratic poetry, beginning, say, with Ζεῦ πάτερ, and it is noteworthy that, opening as they do with a vowel, many of the names of the gods would rebel against δ . Outside of dactylic poetry, outside of epic poetry, there is no interdict against the combination of δ with the name of a god. Lofty Pindar does not balk at δ Ζεῦ, I. 5 (6), 3 or at δ Ζεῦ πάτερ, O. 7, 87 and I. 5 (6) 42 and the honey-tongued Keian nightingale has δ Ζεῦ κεραυνεγχείς 8, 10 (K.) as well as δ χρυσαλάκατοι Χάριτες 9, 1. As for the iambic levellers we are not surprised to find in Archilochos δ Ζεῦ πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος or in Hipponax δ Ζεῦ πάτερ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων πάλμν. So too, the dramatists use δ Ζεῦ, without scruple, from the priestly aristocrat Aischylos to the advanced thinker Euripides. In prose δ becomes colorless, so colorless that puzzled grammarians looked upon it as a manner of article to the vocative (Apoll. Synt. 1, 18). Cf. Jannaris § 251. Then it was the absence of δ that became emotional (S. C. G. § 20), until that emotion also wore itself out, and the vocative without δ ceased to thrill (Blass, G. N. T. § 33, 4). These shifts of ἦθος we encounter everywhere in language. The third attributive position means one thing in the epos, another in prose (A. J. P. XXIII 8). οὐ μὴ loses much of its passion by abuse (A. J. P. XVIII 460). Wilamowitz has called attention to the shifting fortunes of εἶλω and θέλω (H. F.² II 11) and not without interest in this whole matter is the crushing victory of the religious θέλω in modern Greek over the secular βούλομαι (A. J. P. XVI 525). Thinking it might be worth while to see how far the old epic θεσμός obtained in the artificial epic of a later day, I have examined the Argonautica of Apollonios to this end, and my results have been checked by the keener eyes of my

friend, Professor MILLER. The outcome is not considerable because the speeches in Apollonios do not take up relatively so much space as the speeches in Homer; and Apollonios does not deal so much with the gods. But there is no passage in which the gods are addressed by δ except δ 1411 and 1414 (see below), and δ is sparingly used at any rate.

B. L. G.

a. Without ω .¹

α 1 Φοῖβε (3).² 411 ἄναξ (1+2). 420 Ἐκηβόλε (3+4). 422 ἄναξ (3+4). β 693 (3+4). δ 1706 Λητοῖδη. α 242 Ζεῦ ἄνα. δ 1673 Ζεῦ πάτερ. α 295 μήτερ (5). δ 31 μήτερ ἐμή. α 336 φίλοι (1+2). γ 545 (1+2). 553 (1+2). δ 83 (1+2). 190 (3+4). 1347 (1+2). 1554 (1+2). α 463 Αἰσονίδη. 1092. 1332. β 444. 615. γ 475. 941. δ 355. γ 509 ἥρως Αἰσονίδη. α 476 δαιμόνιε. 1257. γ 711 δαιμονίη. 1120. δ 95. 395 (2+3). α 865 δαιμόνιοι. β 880. α 703 Ἴφινόη (2+3). 793 ξείνε. γ 401. δ 33. 89. α 836 Ὑψιπύλη. 900.

β 11 ἀλίπλαγκτοι (1+2+3). 209 Πανελλήνων προφερέστατοι (1+2+3+4). 256 τέκνον (6). 438 Φινεύ (3+4). 622 Τίφν. 869 Αἰακίδη. 886. 1219 ἡθεῖε (2+3). γ 52 ἡθείαι.

γ 1 Ἐρατώ (2+3). 11 θύγατερ Διός (Athena) (3+4). 91 Ἥρῃ Ἀθηναίη τε. 19 Ἥρῃ. 32. 79 πότνα θεά. 91 (see above). δ 1199 Ἥρῃ. γ 108 Κυθέρεια (2+3). 129 ἄφατον κακόν (Eros) (3+4). δ 445 σχετλί' Ἔρως, μέγα πῆμα, μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν. γ 304 παιδὸς ἐμῆς κοῦροι Φριξιοῖό τε. 320 Αἰήτη. 386. 427. 372 λωβητῆρες (5+6). 467 πότνα θεὰ Περσηί (3+4+5). 674 Μήδεια (2+3). δ 739 σχετλίη. γ 688 Χαλκίοπη. 727. δ 32 Χαλκίοπη καὶ πᾶς δόμος (2+3+4). γ 975 παρθενική (2+3). 978 κύρη (6).

δ 1 θεά (3+4) = 2 Μοῦσα (3). 552 θεαί (1+2). 984 Μοῦσαι (6). 757 Ἴρι φίλη. 783 Θέτι δία (2+3). 1014 βασιλεια (2+3) = 1026 πότνα. 1047 σχετίλοι ἀτροπίης καὶ ἀνηλές. 1073 ναὶ φίλος = 1079 ἄναξ (1+2) = 1086 φίλε (1). 1098 Ἀρήτη. 1318 κάμμορε. 1333 ἐρημονόμοι κυδραὶ θεαί (1+2+3+4). 1485 Κάνθε. 1564 ἥρως (6). 1597 δαῖμον. 1773 ἀριστῶν μακάρων γένος (1+2+3+4).

¹ While the list of vocatives here given is not claimed to be exhaustive, it is not likely that the few vocatives that may have escaped observation would materially affect the results of a comparison between Homer's and Apollonios' usage.

² The numerals in parentheses designate the foot or feet in which the expression is found. When no numerals follow, the word begins with the first foot.

b. With δ .

α 616 δ μέλαι, ζήλοιο τ' ἐπισμυγερός ἀκόρητοι. 657 δ φίλαι. γ 891.
 β 468 δ φίλοι. 641. 774. 1200. γ 171. 492. 523. δ 1741 δ φίλε (5).
 α 1337 δ πέπον. γ 485. δ 1749. Cf. β 244 δ δειλ'. 288 δ νιείς Βορέω
 (2+3+4). 341 δ μέλει. 411 δ γέρον. 420 δ τέκος. γ 936 δ
 κακόμαντι (2+3). δ 1031 δ περί δὴ μέγα φέρτατοι (2+3+4). 1383
 δ περί δὴ μέγα φέρτατοι νῆες ἀνάκτων (2+3+4+5+6). 1411 δαίμονες
 δ καλαὶ καὶ εὐφρονες, ἱλατ', ἀνασσαι. 1414 δ νύμφαι, ἱερὸν γένος Ὀκεανοῖο
 (2+3+4+5+6).

It might be interesting to note also the following:

α 290 δ μοι ἐμῆς ἄτης. γ 798. γ 674 δ μοι ἐγώ. γ 558 δ πόποι.
 δ 1458.

C. W. E. MILLER.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Eumenides of Aeschylus, with Introduction and Notes by
A. SIDGWICK, M. A. Third Edition. Oxford, 1902.

Teachers of the classics are familiar with Mr. Sidgwick's editions of the Oresteian trilogy. That these have proved a valuable introduction to the study of Aeschylus, needs neither statement nor argument. Assuming that this series of text-books has a future as well as a past, it may be worth while to offer some remarks, based upon class-room experience, concerning the third edition of the Eumenides.

The editor has done well to omit the asterisks which formerly marked deviations from the manuscript readings and to give in their place adequate critical notes. In the revision of the punctuation, the third edition does not seem to mark an improvement over the second. Cases in point are the insertion of a comma in 690, its omission in 807, the substitution of colon for comma in 408. After 830, the comma does not bear out the interpretation given in the note. The entire absence of punctuation after 1028 is evidently an oversight, as is also the false form *αἰμητηρόν*, 137.

Concerning the notes, the following comments may be made. The expression in vs. 30 is not an abridgment of two constructions but a survival of the ablative genitive. "Reckoning from my former entrances, may this response be the best." This is an epic construction (*Iliad* 1, 505, etc.), and is used by Thucydides 1, 1, *Soph. Antig.* 102, 1212. To translate *ἐφύσω*, 502, "let loose," or with Liddell and Scott, "send upon", is to attribute too much to the Furies. They do not threaten to promote murder, but give warning that if their power is broken murder will take its unchecked course. Their part is permissive. The translation of 503-5 is lacking in clearness. In 661 Mr. Sidgwick seems to make *ἔρνος* the antecedent of *οἷσι*. The dative case is against this interpretation. The pronoun is a dative of interest, and the logical antecedent is *ὁ θρόσκων*. A note explaining the prevalence of this theory of parentage would be welcome. The sequence of thought in 826-8 is not correctly given in the note. There is nothing adversative in these verses. When Athena says, "I have trust in Zeus," she means not in his wisdom and justice but in his power. The chorus had threatened violence. Athena replies: You talk of force. I too have an appeal to force. I know where the thunderbolt of Zeus is kept. But we need not appeal to force.

A general note prefixed to the passage 711-730 would be helpful to the young student. Antithesis is the key to the understanding

of this balanced debate whose component parts are a word by the chorus and a retort by Apollo. Verses 731-733, spoken by the chorus, mark the conclusion of the debate. The context, then, indicates that the relation between 731 and 732 is something as follows: Since you flout me, I will wait for the decision and have no further words with you.

The verses from 734 to 753 have been a battle ground of interpreters. Mr. Sidgwick adopts the view of Müller, that Athena does not actually vote for Orestes until after the votes of the judges have been counted and found even for condemnation and acquittal. The logic of this position is that the goddess does, essentially, but one thing toward the acquittal. She makes a ruling, vs. 741, to cover the contingency of a tie vote. Her vote does nothing new in principle but merely puts in concrete form the abstract doctrine that the accused goes free, not only if he have a majority but even if he have the same number of votes as are given for conviction. Mr. Sidgwick admits that it appears at first that Athena actually votes. His reasons for accepting the other view are not exegetical but are found in certain general considerations: e. g. "This would make the court an odd number." Yet the number of the judges is nowhere given, and the number 12 for which Müller contends is nothing more than an inference that has never commanded general assent. The theory of the symbolism of this scene has a like foundation. The question is whether the gods, Athena and Zeus, to whom Orestes attributes his deliverance, take no more active part than to ordain that in cases of doubt mercy shall prevail. Against this view are the repeated references to Zeus as the real sponsor both for the act of Orestes and for his acquittal. To the authority of Zeus both Athena and Apollo make appeal: cf. vss. 19, 616 ff., 797 ff., 826 ff. Further, that Athena herself finally takes sides and declares for Orestes appears from the passage now under consideration. In vs. 734 she says that it is her part *λοισθίαν κρίναι δίκην*. Then holding up a ballot she announces that she will cast it for Orestes. This declaration is followed by five verses introduced by *γάρ*. The purpose and content of these verses are of importance. The goddess gives therein her reasons for preferring the cause of Orestes. After this statement comes vs. 741, containing the ruling for the contingency of a tie vote. Müller held that the five explanatory verses lead up to 741 and explain it. He translates 741 accordingly: "Drum siegt Orestes auch bei gleicher Stimmenzahl." But to find causal coordination in *δέ* is impossible since 736-740 have already been brought into relation to 735 by means of *γάρ*. In other words, the explanation explains the vote, not the ruling, and the voting and ruling are two distinct things. Moreover the phrase *κρίναι δίκην* describes the act of a judge and means, to pass upon the case. The expression is so used in 433, 468 and 682. Athena, then, takes sides and votes. She does for the acquittal of Orestes two distinct things: she votes and she

rules. Her vote is cast before the count. The objection has been often raised that Athena had declared in vss. 471 f. that she herself might not decide the case. Hermann answered by saying that she might refuse to be the sole judge and yet act as one of a number of judges. It may be added that the declaration of Athena needs to be interpreted in the light of the rest of the play. Mortals actually do pass upon the case, although Athena has said at first that the matter is too great for them; and the goddess actually votes. The institution of a court, divinely appointed and destined for all time, is something new, and transcends the objections which at first seemed to forbid the rendering of any decision at Athens.

The question of a change of scene in a Greek tragedy is one of importance. In the *Eumenides* that question is not only important but is beset with difficulties. That the scene changes after 234 from Delphi to Athens needs no proof. In a note to 235 Mr. Sidgwick indicates that the temple of Athena Polias on the Acropolis is the place of action. Further, on p. 8 of the introduction and in the notes to vss. 687, 918 and 1024 a second change of scene from the Acropolis to the Areopagus is assumed. Many English works of reference agree with Mr. Sidgwick that the trial takes place on the Areopagus; which is equivalent to saying that there are two changes of scene in the *Eumenides*. There are, however, certain facts in the play itself which make this hypothesis difficult to accept, and it may fairly be said that recent discussions of the point in question have made the hypothesis untenable. These facts and a summary of these discussions will now be given.

The references to the image and shrine of Athena in vss. 80, 242 and 440 point unmistakably to the Acropolis. If the scene afterwards is the Areopagus, the change must take place between 489 and 566. But in 487-8, upon her departure to select the judges, Athena says, *κρίνασα . . . ἤξω*; which means that she will return, not that she will proceed with her court to some place of which no hint is given. The continued presence of the chorus must be taken for granted. No pretext for their absence can be found between 489 and the end of the play. This fact raises a presumption against any change. And yet, in vss. 685 ff. the Areopagus is plainly indicated as the scene by the use of the pronouns *τόνδ', τήνδ'*. From this point to the end of the play, the single passage to which one can appeal is that which describes the escort of the *Eumenides* to their new home. The reference, in 1024 ff., to the attendants who care for the shrine of the goddess and who are to form a part of the procession is most naturally explained upon the supposition that the scene is still before the temple of Athena on the Acropolis. The situation, then, for the play as a whole is this, that from verse 235 to the end all the facts indicate the Acropolis, excepting only the passage beginning with vs. 685. This isolated passage speaks for the Areopagus.

The expectation of the modern reader of the play is that when the court of the Areopagus is to be founded, the act of founding will take place on the Areopagus. This isolated passage, reinforced by the reader's natural expectation, has led to the view that there is a second change of scene. This is evidently the view of Mr. Sidgwick, although he nowhere indicates at what point the change occurs.

There is another view that may be thus formulated: this isolated passage which points to the Areopagus may not be used as a standard but must be brought into harmony with its environment. Müller endeavored to attain this end by interpretation. He held that the Areopagus was so represented on one of the periacti that it could be pointed out by the goddess, and that the phrase πόλιν νεόπολιν τήνδ' referred to the Acropolis. The grammatical impossibility of this interpretation was pointed out by Hermann, and the supposition that periacti were a part of the Aeschylean theatre can no longer be maintained. Weil has held that the trial takes place upon the Acropolis but that the actor steps forward and points to the actual Areopagus. Wecklein cuts the knot by classing the passage with certain others that are, in his judgment, the work of a later hand. The third way of meeting the situation is by emending the two deictic pronouns which are the real seat of the difficulty. Paley and Kirchhoff suggest τῇδ', which makes it possible to refer πόλιν νεόπολιν to the Areopagus and still to find in the text the needed reference to the Acropolis. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has taken the next step by reading for τόνδ', οὗδ'. This emendation provides for the accusative πάγον and brings the whole passage into harmony with the rest of the play. It removes the last exegetical reason for saying that the scene changes a second time and that the trial takes place on the Areopagus. It should be observed that cumulative evidence points to this passage as the seat of a textual error. Those who still maintain that the text is sound and that the scene is actually on the Areopagus, are bound to deal with the entire body of evidence which the play presents. Mr. Sidgwick refers in his preface to the Griechische Tragoedien by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. The German scholar's prior and more important discussion of the Eumenides is to be found where one would not ordinarily seek it, in Vol. II of Aristoteles und Athen, Berlin, 1893. This incisive piece of dramatic criticism, which maintains the essential integrity of the text and proceeds always from a keen interpretation of the text, leaves at the door of every editor of the Eumenides the duty and privilege of rethinking many of the oft-debated questions which this drama suggests.

In conclusion the opinion may be expressed that this series of books is incomplete without some treatment of the metres. The state of the text often makes this a difficult task, but at no one point can the editor more effectively help the teacher.

HAMILTON COLLEGE, CLINTON, N. Y.

EDWARD FITCH.

The Works of John Gower, Edited by G. C. MACAULAY, Vols. I-IV. Clarendon Press. 1899-1902.

A critical edition of the *Confessio Amantis* of Gower has long been a desideratum to the Middle English student. The Clarendon Press has undertaken not only to supply this want but also to give us an improved text of the Latin and French works, which have been printed only in a form inaccessible to most readers. It has further printed for the first time the long-lost French poem, of which no trace was supposed to be left. This task has been entrusted to the editorial care of Mr. G. C. Macaulay.

The first volume is devoted to the French works of the poet. There can be no doubt that the long didactic poem, *Mirour de l'omme*, which is still unfinished at the point where the manuscript breaks off with verse 29945, is the work of the "moral Gower". Its title, its general theme, its plan of subdivision, according to its accompanying Table of Contents, all correspond to the description by the author himself of his French work, *Speculum Hominis*, or, as he afterwards called it, *Speculum Meditantis*, the name by which the statements of Leland and Bale have caused it to be known. The genealogical arrangement in the treatment of the Vices, the constant use of certain authorities, a vocabulary and language similar to that of his acknowledged French poems, even tricks of expression common to his English and Latin works, and, it must be added, its prolixity, offer more internal evidence of the authorship of the work than can be found in the recently discovered *Méliador* of Froissart, or the work upon the Athenian constitution of Aristotle.

True, some of these points are not so much emphasized by the editor as they should have been, owing to the fact—for which he apologizes to the specialist—that he has not the equipment incidentally necessary to the editor of an Old French text. For instance, he does not seem to be acquainted with certain works on Old French grammar in general, or on the peculiarities of the dialect in which Gower wrote. The remarks upon the phonology and inflection, written without the aid of such important works as Busch's study of the Anglo-Norman dialect of the fourteenth century, and Stürzinger's introduction to his edition of the *Orthographia Gallica*, need not be discussed in detail. Enough to say that the change of *ai* into *ei*, which is regarded as exceptional by Mr. Macaulay, is a regular phenomenon in the development of that diphthong into *e*, and that there is no evidence to show that the historical spelling *ai* (not final) had a different pronunciation from the phonetic spelling *e* (pp. xxiii-xxiv). There is no doubt that the diphthong *ue* lost its pronunciation as such at an early period in Anglo-Norman, even if the spellings *oe* and *eo* were retained (pp. xxv-xxvi), and it has been equally well ascertained that *eu* and *ui* were simplified in pronunciation and spelling to *u* (pp. xxviii-xxix). Furthermore, the change in spelling and sound of *ui* to *i* was not an unknown development.

The editor is quite right in his supposition that the Marriage of the Deadly Sins was not a new idea with Gower. For we have not only the French poem, *Li mariage des filles au diable*,—cited from a Bodleian manuscript (p. liii), though it is to be found in Jubinal's *Nouveau Recueil de Contes, Dits, etc.*, Vol. I, pp. 283 ff.,—but the same theme appears elsewhere in mediaeval didactic literature (T. F. Crane, *Exempla of Jacques de Vitry*, pp. 235-6).

The single manuscript of the *Mirour* does not present any special difficulties to the editor, although it is unfortunate that such words as "de par", "par dehors", etc., have been spelled as single words contrary to the practice of the most competent editors, while "pieça" would have been better written "piec'a". A collation of the only known manuscript of the *Balades*, and of the several manuscripts of the *Traitié*, has suggested corrections of a number of readings and emendations found in the editions of the Roxburghe Club and of Stengel.

In the notes, precise and accurate explanations of syntactical constructions could have been given, if more recent discussions than those found in Burguy had been used. For instance, Tobler has treated in full the use of the conditional in place of the imperfect subjunctive in conditional clauses (*Mir.* 25; *Vermischte Beiträge*, Vol. III, p. 47), the periphrastic use of "faire" (*Mir.* 1135; *V. M.* Vol. I, p. 19), and the substantive use of the infinitive with an accompanying object (*Mir.* 987; *V. B.* Vol. II, p. 90). Examples of the frequent interchange of the singular and plural of the second person in verbal forms have been pointed out in Anglo-Norman by Suchier (*St. Auban*, pp. 8-9), and in continental French by Förster (*Richars li Biaus*, Note to verse 969).

The Glossary is a fairly complete *Index Verborum*, but forms of the same word often appear under different headings, while, on the other hand, the accepted meanings of some of the words are omitted. Words which need explanation are listed without comment, as are those which have become modern French and English with a change of meaning. "Claret" is not claret wine, but wine strained through a cloth containing spices, and if both "diamand" (diamond) and "daimant" (loadstone) have their origin in the same word "adamas", their meanings were not confused by mediaeval writers in general, or by Gower (cf. *C. A.* V. 1333, 1397). The use of "geste" (*Mir.* 16398, 26832) with the meaning "family, race" is not noted, and the translation of "alie" (clove of garlic) in the common phrase "*ne valent une alie*", by "alder-berry", reminds one of the origins of Romance Philology, and the Abbé de La Rue's rendering of the same word as "olive". The use of the perfect participles, such as "despit", "contradit", "failli", in an active sense, seems to be quite unknown to the editor, who also fails to call attention to the very rare use of "souvenir" as a reflexive verb, and to the

examples of nouns with the pejorative suffix "aille" in such words as "pedaille", "ribaudaille".

In editing the English works which form the second and third volume, the editor is working on more familiar ground, and he has given a text of the *Confessio Amantis*, which must necessarily supersede the other editions on account of the mass of new material that has been collected and the critical use made of it. The Introduction, Notes, and Glossary show an acquaintance with the better known English works in which the results of investigations in Middle English have been gathered together. The editor, throughout the edition, has a way of constantly using such qualifying expressions as "seems to be", "probably the meaning", "the meaning apparently", and criticism of the Glossary is forestalled by the prefatory statement that "in many cases an explanation is given of the meaning of words for the convenience of readers, but no discussion as to their meaning or origin is admitted in the Glossary". It is questionable as to whether "non" is to be rendered "noon", as the editor thinks, or, more fully as "the hour of dinner", which originally came at the ninth canonical hour, or three in the afternoon, but there is no doubt that "prime" was the first hour of the canonical day as "undern" was the third. Yet neither of these words is explained in the Glossary. That "enderday" is to be rendered "the other day", and that the expression "cowthe him thonk" is the English equivalent of the French idiom "*savoir gré*" may be known to the editor, but not to all his readers. He notes, only to leave unexplained, the common expression "to bere on hond", which means "to beguile, deceive", and when "*painde-meine*" (*panis dominicus*, *simnel* bread) appears as an English word, he does not make amends for his failure to define it in the French Glossary.

Gower's Latin works, which have the advantage of being preserved in original copies, with corrections of the author, are presented in the fourth volume, with a text superior in every way to that found in the former uncritical editions. The Glossary, which is very properly confined to words unclassical in form and usage, would have been made more useful by the inclusion of all proper names. In the *Life of Gower*, prefatory to the volume, no new details have been added. But re-examination of the original documents has shown the worthlessness of the evidence afforded by some of them which have previously been supposed to bear upon the life of the poet.

Mr. Macaulay emphasizes the encyclopaedic character of Gower's works, and for this reason he should have come to his task with a wide acquaintance with mediaeval literature, both in Latin and the vernacular tongues, and should have been conversant with the results of the more recent investigations. Warton and Morley, in their treatment of Gower, have furnished the basis of the commentary on the *Confessio Amantis*, and the lack of

even this slight aid is apparent in the notes to the French and Latin works. But withal, the illustrative notes upon the sources of stories and phrases in the English work show a decided improvement on those in the first volume. The Latin works are treated with less detail of illustration, as they are regarded as historical documents rather than as literary efforts, but the frequent citations of parallel passages from Ovid, and from the poems of Peter Riga and Alexander Neckham, incline one to judge Gower's Latin verse as centos rather than as original compositions.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DURHAM, N. C.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Ancient Athens, by ERNEST ARTHUR GARDNER, Yates Professor of Archaeology in University College, London; formerly Director of the British School at Athens; author of *A Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, etc., etc. Illustrated. New York, 1902. The Macmillan Company. 8°. Pp. XVI, 579.

The need of a new work on Athens, presenting within the covers of a single book a comprehensive and at the same time scholarly treatment of the topography and monuments of the ancient city in the light of recent discoveries, has been growing more and more acute during the past few years. Those who have felt this need will feel grateful to Professor Gardner for his work on Ancient Athens. Its comprehensiveness will be seen from the list of its chapters: I. Situation and Natural Features; II. The Walls of the Acropolis and the Town; III. The Acropolis before the Persian Wars; IV. The Town before the Persian Wars; V. Early Attic Art; VI. The Acropolis in the Fifth Century; VII. The Parthenon; VIII. The Erechtheum and the Temple of Victory; IX. The City in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries; X. The Theseum, the Asclepieum and the Theater; XI. The Ceramicus; XII. Athens in Hellenistic and Roman Times; XIII. Pausanias in Athens; XIV. The Piraeus. The author's method is thus seen to be chronological in the main. The effect of clearness and connectedness resulting from the method is enhanced by the author's gift of clear, orderly, and concise statement.

Although Professor Gardner's aim, according to his publishers, is "to give an adequate and at the same time popular account of ancient Athens", his work can be called popular only in a very limited sense. It is true that its pages are not heavily weighted with references, and that the minutiae of some of the disputed questions are relegated to notes at the ends of chapters; but the employment of long passages of Greek as prefaces to chapters, the frequent quotation of Greek in the text, and the general assumption that the reader is conversant with the topography and monuments of ancient Athens are hardly marks of popular

treatment. Nor can the author's style be called popular. Pure and clear as it is, it is not characterized by the ease and grace which are naturally expected of one who addresses the wider audience. The author's face is rarely seen in his page, and when it does appear, it is always impassive. It is vain to watch for it to be lighted by a relieving gleam of humor.¹ Professor Gardner keeps to his work; his sober wishes never learned to stray. If the reader is not fascinated by the subject itself, the author's condensed, matter-of-fact, unsmiling style will hardly carry him along in its current.

But these defects exist only when the book is considered as a popular work. When it is considered from the right point of view, the so-called defects are seen to constitute the merits of the work. The fact is that *Ancient Athens* is a work for an audience of students—not only the close circle of specialists, but the wider circle of all classical students and teachers, especially those whose interest has been stimulated by travel in classic lands. It will be of interest and value to specialists because of its admirably concise, clear and impartial summaries of views on disputed questions, and because Professor Gardner never fails to take a stand of his own and lend the important weight of his own authority to one or the other of the parties to the dispute. He is always fair, and never dogmatic. As might be expected of the author of *A Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, he is conservative, and avowedly so (p. VI). He holds with Frazer and against Dörpfeld (p. 210) that the early temple of Athena on the Acropolis was not rebuilt after the Persian Wars; he states his own opinion (p. 449) "that the use of the raised proscenium or *λογεῖον* as a stage for the actors is established by very clear evidence in the case of the later Greek theater, and this analogy would lead one to expect some such platform in the Greek theater of earlier times also"; he agrees with Leake, Curtius, and others of the older school of topographers in holding (pp. 535-8) that in Pausanias I 8, 3 "Enneacrunus was certainly in the bed of the Ilissus", and "that it and the other buildings mentioned with it are inserted here for some reason out of topographical order." He cites the Bologna head, identified by Furtwängler as part of a copy of the Lemnian Athena, "as a concession to a theory admitted by many archaeologists" (p. 255).

But it is to the wider circle of students of Greek literature and art that Professor Gardner's work will be more welcome. For them the work is invaluable as a clear-cut and up-to-date presentation of what students of Greek culture ought to know and desire to know. It can be called popular, then, only in that it will appeal to the larger audience of scholars.

It will be regretted by many that Professor Gardner has not seen fit to give his audience, composed as it will be entirely of

¹ There is a single possible exception, p. 159, foot-note.

seekers after information, more aid in the form of references to ancient and modern literature. Many who are not fortunate in having the specialist's knowledge would be glad to be referred more often to classical authority. Of still greater service would have been a few more select references to the literature of modern scholarship. Grouped conveniently in one place at the end of chapters, or of sections of chapters treating single monuments or questions, such references would in no way detract from the appearance of the work, and would add greatly to its value to the student.

As to other features of the book, in binding and general make-up, it is a companion to *Mau-Kelsey: Pompeii, Its Life and Art*. Among its 179 illustrations are eight photogravures and nine maps and plans. The photogravures are as perfect as could be wished. Among maps and plans every one will miss that of the city of Athens, whose insertion seems to have been intended (p. 538), but which one looks for in vain. The photographic illustrations are in the main good, with the exception of some few in which a wide sweep of city or landscape is reduced to so small a space as to confuse and obscure the outlines of individual features (e. g. pp. 2, 8, 12). On pp. 6 and 7 the eye is offended by the projection of the illustrations beyond the edge of the print of the page. The page in this work is not so pleasant and harmonious as that of the *Mau-Kelsey* volume; the size of the type and the wide spacing are a trifle out of keeping with the serious content of the text, and the effect of type, spacing and margin, especially at the top of the page, is to make one uncomfortable. There are a few typographical errors which will not please Professor Gardner, as for example: p. 149, southwest for southeast; 154, Sparta for Spata; 160, des deutsches Institut; 164, oenochoe.

But thought of the few faults of the work, both literary and mechanical, vanishes from the mind of the reader as he accompanies the author in his admirable presentation of this most fascinating subject. Professor Gardner's *Ancient Athens* ought to be on the shelf of every student and teacher of the classics, and of every other person who delights in the reconstruction of the home of the most interesting community of the ancient Greek world.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

Dante and the Animal Kingdom. By RICHARD THAYER HOLBROOK, Ph.D. New York, The Columbia University Press. 376 pages.

Voltaire says of Dante, 'Few people understand his oracles. He has commentators, which perhaps is another reason for his

not being understood.' These words are the more interesting in view of the enormous accumulation of literature about the name of Dante during the last hundred years. The incomparable Fiske collection at Cornell, for example, contains more than seven thousand works. Of all this number many, no doubt, deserve the great Frenchman's scorn; but among those which do not it seems fair to place Mr. Holbrook's work on Dante's animals.

The author has devoted a chapter to each species of bird or beast alluded to by Dante, and in two or three prefatory chapters deals more generally with the various orders of life employed by the poet—including both supernatural and monstrous forms—and with the zoological knowledge and theories of later mediæval times. The book is furnished with abundant illustrative material drawn from mediæval writers, or carefully reproduced from carved portal and illuminated page. Had the author been content in many cases with mere citation or concise paraphrase of his authorities, or satisfied to quote his Dante either in Italian or in English, instead of in both, he might have reduced the bulk of his work at least by a fourth and made it more convenient. But, except for certain faults in technique, little may be urged against the book as a work of reference, and as a useful source of information concerning an important element in Dante's art.

The spirit of Mr. Holbrook's work leaves something to be desired. His attitude is on the whole one of amused and superior curiosity. At times he deals in flippant and unbecoming scorn, as when he says that Dante 'would not have introduced an infernal menagerie in any thoroughly orthodox hell,' or calls Minos 'the queerest of Dante's infernal functionaries', adding that 'after thirteen hundred years Minos has grown a tail—the chief justice of the nether world has a tail!—and no ordinary appendage.'

Dante is 'the most wonderful man of the Middle Ages, because he is their most perfect expression', which is faint praise from one who seems, with Gibbon, to regard the poet's time as 'a dark age of false and barbarous science.' Dante is represented as a struggling victim of 'a perverted philosophy,' and there is throughout a manifest tendency to condemn his thought, but praise his poetry. The distinction between thought and poetry is, we fear, too subtle for many of Mr. Holbrook's readers to follow; he reasons as one who attempts to discover the soul and virtue of Gothic architecture in finial, and leaf, and niche, at the same time despising the lofty grandeur of nave and transept as monstrous, or the mystery of the receding choir as mere artifice.

It is to be feared that in the respects just mentioned the work before us represents the character of much so-called appreciation of Dante to-day. We have become fascinated in our time with

physical science, and blinded with the splendor of our own achievements in this field. Darwin seems much more reasonable and precious to us than Dante. Evolution offers to many an apocalypse of deeper meaning than the vision on Patmos. Mr. Holbrook appears—unconsciously, no doubt—to intimate as much when he says that 'man's true place in nature' is to be discovered 'not in oracles, but in the bosom of the earth,' and betrays his own conviction that 'bestiality' is the 'natural condition of man.'

Dante's thought is that of Thomas Aquinas and Albertus; and they and their forerunners had for some hundreds of years been searching, not indeed in the bosom of the earth, but in higher regions, for the secret of man's true place in nature. To them the words 'man' and 'nature' meant something other—perhaps greater—than they do in the pages before us, illuminated though these pages be with the light of modern science. It seems unreasonable that these men should for centuries have been straining their vision to peer into the mysteries of human life, and of the soul and its relations to the infinite, without discovering some truth, perhaps as necessary to us as any which later generations have wrung from 'the bosom of the earth.'

It is said of Professor Sophocles that when he conversed of certain of the Greek Fathers, he seemed to be speaking of his most intimate friends. By a sort of triumph of learning over the blinding prejudices and limitations of his day, he was able to move familiarly among those ancient priests and teachers, to know them as they were, to understand them even better than their most intimate acquaintances could have done. Thus the true scholar invariably seeks to transcend his own time, and to put himself in a position where he may see in its true values and relations the age which he studies. Of this Voltaire as a critic of Dante furnishes a monitory example. He was a man of his times, and an oracle to most of his contemporaries. He called Dante a madman; to him the *Divine Comedy* was at best a mere collection of 'plaisanteries,' or, at worst, the product of an imagination 'stupidly extravagant and barbarous.' Absurd as such opinions seem at the end of a hundred and fifty years, is it unreasonable to expect a like fate for careless judgments of Dante informed only by the spirit of our time?

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, Vol. XXVI.

No. 1.

1. Pp. 5-11. A dedication to Jupiter Dolichenus, by Franz Cumont. Critical discussion of a mutilated inscription used by A. H. Kan in his *De Iovis Dolicheni cultu* (Corpus III, 1128).
2. Pp. 12-30. The unexpressed in the Satires of Horace, by A. Cartault. A minute analysis of the various ways in which Horace in the Satires leaves it to the reader to supply thought not expressed by the words used.
3. Pp. 30f. A. Cartault explains Hor. Sat. II. 3. 274 as referring to an affected pronunciation of certain letters.
4. Pp. 32-7. Karl Hude replies to the criticisms of Daniel Serruys on his edition of Thucydides, especially in regard to Laur. LXIX 30.
5. Pp. 38-43. A manuscript of Solinus revealed by Tironian notes, by Émile Chatelain. The MS Vossianus Q. 87 of the library of the University of Leyden contains many notes and corrections in Tironian shorthand. From these Chatelain draws conclusions as to the reading of the MS from which the corrections were taken, and cites many examples.
6. Pp. 44-62. A. Misier classifies the Parisian MSS of Gregory of Nazianzus (the five theological discourses).
7. Pp. 63-97. Critical study of the Appendix of St. Cyprian, by Paul Monceau. It is impossible here to summarize this able article.
8. P. 98. B. Haussoullier calls attention to an inscription that has been overlooked by historians of the Seleucidae.
9. Pp. 99-104. On an inscription of Troezen, by Ph. E. Legrand. Further discussion, with some corrections of previous discussion (*Bulletin archéologique*, etc., XXIV, pp. 191-9) of an inscription treated also by B. Haussoullier (*Rev. de Phil.* 1901, pp. 336-8).
10. Pp. 105-125. Metrical laws of Latin prose as exhibited in the Brutus, by Henri Bornecque. The author examines, not merely the close, but every part, of the sentence. He concludes that in the Brutus Cicero applies metrical laws to all parts of the sentence; that these laws are less strict than those employed by

Pliny the Younger in his Panegyric of Trajan; and that in Cicero these laws are purely negative, and are shaped to prevent any resemblance of prose to poetry.

11. Pp. 125-43. The Milesian islands, by B. Haussoullier. Interesting investigation, by means of inscriptions and other sources, of the relations to Miletus of Leros, Lepisia, Patmos, and the Corsiae.

12. Pp. 143-8. Remarks on the syntax of *cum*, by F. Gaffiot. An attack upon Lebreton's treatment of "*cum* pour exprimer l'équivalence", which designation, he says, Lebreton got from Hale. He says "*cum*" always means "when", "at the time that", never "in that".

No. 2.

1. Pp. 149-157. *Orientiana*, by Louis Havet. Critical notes on many passages of Orientius, a Christian writer of about A. D. 400.

2. P. 157. In Plaut. Men. 1158 Louis Havet reads "*praeuidia*" for "*fundi*".

3. Pp. 158-63. Notes on a few passages of the Theaetetus by Louis Laloy.

4. Pp. 164-80. An exhaustive discussion of Catullus 67, by R. Cahen. The article presents what the author considers the minimum of necessary emendations.

5. Pp. 180-81. *Ad Oracula Chaldaica*, v. 7 f., by J. Bidez. For *ob* he reads *ob*.

6. Pp. 182-94. *Ciceronian Studies*, by J. Lebreton. The author had published a work in which he treated *cum* in equivalent or identical propositions. M. Gaffiot in the January number (see above) had attacked his views, maintaining that *cum* is always purely temporal. The present article discusses at length *cum* and *quod* in identical propositions in Cicero.

7. Pp. 195-210. The life of Sextus Empiricus, by Wilhelm Vollgraff. It has been thought that we know practically nothing of the life of Sextus Empiricus; but Vollgraff convincingly identifies him with the Sextus noticed by Suidas, and then by means of this and other sources thus rendered available, restores the great essentials of his life: the place of his birth, the epoch in which he lived, his family, his relations, his career, his philosophy, style, and the chief traits of his character.

8. Pp. 211-12. W. M. Lindsay discusses the provenience of certain MSS of Nonius Marcellus.

9. Pp. 213-15. P. Foucart gives an account of a pedestal found at Rome with an inscription showing that it served for the statue of Pythocles of Elis, the pentathlete, by Polyclitus, the original

pedestal with the autograph of the sculptor and a later copy of the same having been found at Olympia.

10. Pp. 216-18. P. Foucart, using a notice (Séguier de Saint-Brissson, *Notices et Extraits des manuscrits grecs*, t. XIV, 2^e partie, 1841) of a charge in an oration against one Phryne, shows that there probably was at Athens an explicit law against the introduction of strange divinities, and adds some remarks of interest.

11. Pp. 219-21. R. Poupardin publishes a note on MS G. gg, of the Vallicellian Library in Rome.

12. Pp. 222-3. L. Dautremere discusses an inscription of Timgad, consisting of five hexameters.

13. Pp. 224-8. Franz Cumont, starting out with a rescript of the emperor Julian (Ep. 11), investigates the significance of the title *πατρόβουλος*, arguing that it was equivalent to *patronus*, and was bestowed with certain privileges in some provinces on the descendants of rich and influential personages who had assumed the hereditary obligation to protect the citizens. But see No. 3, pp. 272-8 and 278 f.

14. Pp. 229-52. Book Notices. 1. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechisches Lesebuch*, Berlin, 1902. Noticed jointly by B. Haussoullier and E. Chambry. "That Greek studies are menaced in France, and that we are driven first to defend them and perhaps to sacrifice them to save Latin studies, the last citadel of classical instruction, is a proposition contested by no one". Such is the mournful strain with which Haussoullier introduces his comments, which are directed to showing how this great Reader may be made, even in France, to contribute something to a revival of Hellenic studies. Chambry gives a table of contents of the work, regretting some omissions, but commending the selections. As to the scholarship of the work, of course no remarks were necessary. 2. *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, herausgegeben von C. F. Lehmann, I Band, Leipzig, 1901-2. B. Haussoullier commends this new periodical, gives a table of contents, and makes some remarks on special points. 3. P. Foucart, *Les Grands Mystères d'Éleusis*. *Personnel, Cérémonies*, Paris, 1900. Analyzed at some length by B. Haussoullier. 4. *Schulwörterbuch zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee*, von Christian Harder, Leipzig, 1900. Albert Martin compares this work, published by Freytag, with Autenrieth's lexicon published by Teubner, pointing out wherein it is better, wherein not so good. 5. A. M. mentions favorably three works published by E. Loescher at Turin: *Omero, L'Iliade commentata da C. O. Zuretti*, vol. III, Libri IX-XII, 1900; *Eschilo, I Persiani con note di Vigilio Inama*, 1900; *Sophocle, Antigone con note di Placido Cesareo*. 6. *Aristophanis Equites. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis*, edidit J. von Leeuwen, Leyden, 1900. A. M. devotes a notice of this work chiefly to arguments against the

author's theory that Aristophanes was an Aeginetan and as such not allowed to produce plays in his own name in Athens.

7. Thukydides erklärt von J. Classen. Vierter Band. Viertes Buch. Dritte Auflage bearbeitet von J. Steup. Berlin, 1900. Reviewed at length by E. Chambry. The reviewer states that he had not been able to commend previous revisions of Classen by Steup; but this volume he praises highly, enumerating, however, many points on which he is not in accord with him.

8. Longinus on the Sublime. The Greek text with introduction, translation, etc., by W. Rhys Roberts. Cambridge, 1899. By the same: Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The three Literary Letters. The Greek text with translation, etc. Camb., 1902. Noticed very favorably by Albert Martin. The title of the first named work misleads: Roberts holds that all we can say of the author of the *περὶ ὕψους* is that he lived in the first century of our era.

9. *Catalogus Codicum astrologorum Graecorum: III. Codices Mediolanenses descripserunt Aemygdus Martini et Domenicus Bassi.* Brussels, 1901. Noticed by A. M. This volume contains the list of the Greek MSS of Milan, thirty-six in number.

10. *Bibliothèque Maraslis.* N. G. Politis, *Μελέται περὶ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς γλώσσης τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ λαοῦ. Παροιμίαι.* Vol. I, 1899; Vol. II, 1900. Athens. Noticed favorably by A. M. The work relates only to Modern Greek proverbs. It is arranged alphabetically, and these two large volumes, aggregating 1330 pages, exhaust only the letter A.

11. *Plautus Captivi*, with Introduction, etc., by W. M. Lindsay, London, 1900. Henri Bornecque pronounces this the most complete edition of the *Captivi* in existence, but points out defects according to his view.

12. V. Cucheval, *Cicéron orateur*, 1901, Paris.—G. Jacquinet, *Extraits et Analyses des principaux discours*, Paris.—De la Ville de Mirmont, same title, 1902, Paris.—Julius Wolff, *de Clausulis Ciceronianis*, 1901, Lipsiae. Noticed by Henri Bornecque. The first of these works the reviewer finds very useful for young pupils and the general public, but lacking in scholarship. The works of Jacquinet and De la Ville de Mirmont have each merits of their own. The work of Wolff contains some new things, but much fewer than the author thinks.

13. W. M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus*, 1901, Oxford. Briefly mentioned by H. B. "Fundamental work, extremely interesting, and reaching conclusions hard to refute, written by one of the men best acquainted with Nonius Marcellus".

Pp. 252-56. List of Books received.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

PHILOLOGUS, LX (N. F. Bd. XIV) 1901.

I, pp. 1-16. Th. Zielinski. Marginalien. I. Crit. and exeget. notes to a number of Greek and Latin writers.

II, pp. 17-24. O. Hoffmann. Studien zur griechischen Stamm-bildung. 1. φίλτερος, φίλτατος und Verwandtes. These are from φίλτός, a participle (cf. φίλτογένης) from the stem φίλ-. So βέλτερος from a βελτός, φέρτερος from a φερτός. The superlative -ατος is to be compared with μέσσω-ατος, νέ(F)-ατος, and the -τατος grew from the forms φίλτατος, etc.

III, pp. 25-80. A. Mommsen. Zur Orientierung über die delphische Chronologie. Deals with the names of the days, months, the solar position of the year, etc., the mythical magistrates, the sporadic material from the sixth cent. on. Pp. 51 ff. take up the periods of the priests, and the archontates comprised in the period of each priest.

IV, pp. 81-101. W. H. Roscher. Weiteres über die Bedeutung des E zu Delphi und die übrigen γράμματα Δελφικά. Continuation of his article in Philol. LIX (1900) p. 21 ff. I. Among other meanings given to E is that of the Pythagoreans, who made it symbolize justice because of its resemblance to a balance. Someone proposed that it was a mason's mark misunderstood and given a deep significance. It means, however, 'come'. II. A remarkable parallelism exists between the Δελφικά γράμματα and the ancient Ἐφέσια γράμματα, which were also in hexameter. With Otto Gruppe R. takes the Delphic words in a general sense and applies them to the worshiper as he enters the temple.

V, pp. 102-148. Fr. Reuss. Zur Geschichte des ersten punischen Krieges. The years 255 and 254. The Battle at Panormos. The years 250-248. The fight near the Aegatian Islands. Cato and Polybius. (That P. used C. cannot be inferred from the statement as to the duration of the war.) Polybius and Fabius. Polybius and Philinos. On p. 148 a list of passages where Polybius follows (a) Fabius (b) Philinus.

VI, pp. 149-154. M. Guggenheim. Antisthenes in Platons Politeia. Concludes that Plato, Rep. II. 16 (376 B), intends to hit the cynic. So also in VII. 17 (505 B), 450 A, B, etc.

Miscellen.—1. pp. 155-157. W. Schmid. Kratippos zum dritten Mal. Still holds against Susemihl (Philol. LIX, 537 ff.) that K. was a contemporary of Thucydides.

2. pp. 158-160. P. Groebe. Die Bezeichnung der gewählten Beamten vor dem Amtsantritt. Finds no proof that the term *designatus* could be dispensed with when a magistrate is referred to who has been elected but who has not entered upon his office.

VII, pp. 161-179. Fr. Mie. Die Festordnung der olympischen Spiele. Discussion of the fragment of an Olympian list of victors (no. CCXXII, p. 85 ff.) in Grenfell and Hunt's Oxyrhynchus-Papyri II. Summary on pp. 177-179. After Ol. 78 the festival

lasted five days. On the first day, as Robert rightly observes, fell the preliminary celebration, the oath of the Hellenodikoi and contestants, the trial of the athletes and horses. On the second day came the boys' contest, on the third, the men's, except the pentathlon, which, along with the horse-racing, fell on the fourth. On the last day there took place the chief procession, the official chief offering at the great altar of Zeus and the banquet in the Prytaneion. The contests of trumpeters and heralds are to be placed on the first day.

VIII, pp. 180-191. Fr. Susemihl. Aphorismen zu Demokritos. 1. The utterances of Demokritos about his great travels and his sojourn in Athens, where nobody knew him, were probably contained in his (Μικρός) Διάκοσμος. 2. In the list of the Demokritean writings arranged in tetralogies by Thrasyllus, *περὶ φύσιος πρῶτον* and *περὶ φύσιος ἀνθρώπου β'* are parts of one and the same book. 3. On his journey to Athens. D. may have visited Thebes in 425 and heard the Pythagorean Philolaos, but without receiving a lasting influence. 4. In Laert. Diog. IX 46 the number of books (9) has fallen out after *ὑπομνημάτων ἠθικῶν*. 5. In l. c. § 47, read perhaps *Κανὼν α' β' γ', Περὶ <παν>τοίων ἀπορημάτων*. 6. The *ἀσύντακτα* in the list is a genuine work of D. Appendix. Die Demokriteer Metrodoros und Nausiphane. The Isocratic M. is identical with the Demokritean M.

IX, pp. 192-194. R. Foerster. *Dialexis Choricii inedita* from cod. Matrit. N-101 (= M.)

X, pp. 195-216. A. C. Clark. *Anecdota Parisiensia ad libros epistularum ad Atticum Tornaesianum et Crusellinum*. 1. De fide Bosiana in lectionibus e codice Tornaesiano afferendis. "Summa religione egisse videtur Bosius". 2. De lectionibus e codice Tornaesiano a Turnebo exscriptis. 3. De curis secundis Bosii et de codice Crusellino.

XI, pp. 217-228. W. M. Lindsay. *Die Handschriften von Nonius IV*. In book IV we have the same three classes as in I-III. But in the first class beside L' there is a second preserver of the true form of text, the group H' Gen. B and the Cambridge MS (Z. i. e. Z').

XII, pp. 229-260. J. Fürst. *Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta*. Introduction. History of the relation of the Latin text to a Greek original. In 1892 Patzig's essay in the Byz. Ztschr. I. 135ff. showed that the source for the Diktys-material among the Byzantines was partly Malalas and partly Johannes Antiochenus. In the chronographic literature there is undoubtedly Diktys-material which we do not find in L. Septimius' Ephemeris. I. Diktys bei Malalas. II. Sisyphos von Kos. III. Die Troika des Johannes Antiochenus. IV. Der Diktysbericht des Georgios Kedrenos.

XIII, pp. 261-270. M. Müller. *Ad Senecae tragoedias*. 21 critical notes.

XIV, pp. 271-276. Eb. Nestle. Zur neuen Philo-Ausgabe. Eine Replik zu Band 59, 256-271; 521-536.

XV, pp. 277-281. P. Kretschmer. Spätlateinisches *gamba*. *Gamba* is the Greek loan-word *καμπή*. It is the knee-joint of the hind-leg of an animal. Cf. Veget. ars veter. IV, 1.

XVI, pp. 282-306. W. Sternkopf. Ciceros Briefwechsel mit D. Brutus und die Senatssitzung vom 20 Dez. 44. Summary on p. 305. Brutus writes XI 4: request for the supplicatio—September; Lupus brings this letter from Mutina to Rome in six days, Sept.; Cic. replies with XI 6a, in Sept. or beg. Oct.; he leaves Rome, middle of Oct.; Lupus comes to Rome with a new letter from Brutus (not extant) in Nov.; this letter is sent to the absent Cic. Lupus returns after a few days without answer, Nov.; Cic. returns to Rome Dec. 9, and presumably at once writes XI 5. Lupus again comes to Rome and confers with Cic. The latter writes XI 7 in the middle of Dec. (Dec. 12?) A courier brings the edict of Brutus; there is a meeting of the Senate; Cic. writes XI 6b on Dec. 20.

XVII, pp. 307-314. Fr. Luterbacher. Zur Chronologie des Jahres 218 v. Chr. Justifies his own views (as publ. in his ed. of Livy XXI) against those of W. Osiander (Der Hannibalweg, Berlin, 1900). Hannibal crossed the Alps in the second half of October, taking 15 days.

Miscellen.—3. pp. 315-316. G. Kazarow. Die Entstehungszeit des linkspontischen *Koinón*. This federation is older than the Roman rule.

4. pp. 316-318. P. de Winterfeld. Terentianum. In Ter. Eun. IV. 4. 42 conjectures *etiam nunc non credis miseris non esse inrisas modis?*

5. pp. 318-320. M. Manitius. Handschriftliches zur Nux elegia und zu Ov. Am. I, 5. Cod. Dresdensis A 167^a saec. XII fol. 39^a-41^b often agrees alone with the Florentinus, often disagrees, and often offers a tradition differing widely from the other codd. deteriores.

XVIII, pp. 321-329. J. Boehlau. Ein neuer Erosmythus. A small Attic lekythos of the Kassel Mus. represents Eros as Adonis, who appears as an ephebus in the centre of a group. He is fleeing from a wild boar; from his right hand he has dropped a hydria; a maiden in chiton runs to help with outstretched hands; behind runs another in the act of hurling a broken water-jar. To Eros is attributed the fate of Adonis, something which is not supported from other sources, although parallels between them are found in other respects.

XIX, pp. 330-359. J. Fürst. Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta. (Continued from pp. 229-260.) The Tale of Troy by Kedrenos is combined out of John Malalas and John of Antioch, and a third source, Homer, is not excluded. The Diktys-material in the other Byzantines is then analyzed

under 13 heads. On p. 344 is a stemma showing the descent of the Byzantine material from Diktys and Sisyphos of Kos. VI. On certain single portions of the Byzantine tradition. 1. The prologue and dedicatory epistles. 2. Hecuba's dream. Oneirokrisia. 3. Paris in Sparta. 4. The *anairnōis* of Helen. 5. Achilles' escort to Troy. 6. Expedition against the neighboring Trojan states. 7. Catalogue of the ships. 8. Conquest of Cyprus and Isauria. 9. Homerika. 10. Murder of Palamedes. 11. Priam's request to David and Tautanes for help. 12. Death of Paris and Oenone. 13. Achilles and Polyxena. His death. 14. The wooden horse. Helenus. 15. Mutilation of Deiphobos. 16. The Telegony. 17. Aeneas and Antenor.

XX, pp. 360-373. W. H. Roscher. Zur Bedeutung der Siebenzahl im Kultus und Mythos der Griechen. (Chapter from a larger treatise on the numbers seven and nine in classical antiquity.) 1. The sanctity of the number seven in the cult and myth of Apollo. The seventh month is consecrated to him; the seventh day of the seventh month is his birthday; he was a seven months' child; at his birth the swans are said to have circled about Delos seven times; there were seven events in the Pythian games, and seven mythical competitors entered them; Apollo's lyre had seven strings; at his festival a chorus of seven took part. The tradition of the seven wise men may have originated from the last from the association of wisdom with the oracle at Delphi. 2. The Moirai as inventors of seven letters (Hyg. fab. 277). Roscher conjectures that they were the seven vowels Α Ε Η Ι Ο Υ Ω.

XXI, pp. 374-380. C. Hentze. Die Arbeitsgesänge in den homerischen Gedichten. Homer mentions 2 kinds; 1. 2 569 ff. the Linos-song of the boys in the vineyard. 2. ε 61 ff.; κ 220 ff., 226 ff., songs sung by Calypso and Circe while weaving. The former is not a work-song in Bücher's sense (Arbeit und Rhythmus. 2 ed., 1899), for it is not limited by its content to a single special kind of work. The songs of Calypso and Circe, on the other hand, are such, and were used by the poet to make known, by an appeal to the sense of hearing, the presence of persons who could not (according to the situation) be visible. Most of the work at which singing would be used was done by female slaves, and so was beneath the notice of the poet and his audience.

XXII, pp. 381-401. O. Hense. Zum Ion des Euripides. Annotations to a number of passages.

XXIII, pp. 402-426. E. Kornemann. Die Caesarische Kolonie Karthago und die Einführung römischen Gemeindeordnung in Africa. From evidence of inscriptions, etc., the following conclusions are reached, p. 423-4: 1. Caesar intended to realize at one stroke the establishment of the provincial administration of the west also, on the basis of community-self-government. In bringing this about he did not shrink from

making cities with such great territories and such a mass of dependencies that they were no longer ordinary provincial cities but presented true copies of the Hellenistic city-states. 2. He created Latin as well as Roman colonies in the provinces; perhaps also *coloniae peregrinae*, not only colonies that were autonomous, but also among the non-Romans, colonies incorporated in a greater federation of communities. 3. He adhered to local forms as much as possible. 4. Perhaps he intended to equip all autonomous communities of the west with the Roman or the Latin *ius*.

XXIV, pp. 427-439. P. Egenolff. Handschriftliches zu Plutarchs *Moralia*. Results of a collation of cod. Pal. Gr. 283 (containing seven essays). Continuation of an article in Berl. phil. Wochs. XIV (1894), which presented a collation of cod. Pal. Gr. 153 (containing five essays).

XXV, pp. 440-445. R. Herzog. Ein Athlet als Schauspieler. Discussion of an inscription in Dittenberger Syll.² No. 700.

XXVI, pp. 446-471. K. Giesen. Plutarchs *Quaestiones graecae* und Aristoteles' *Politien*. Summary on p. 471. The contents of *Quaestiones* 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 14-20, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39, which for the most part deal with political subjects in the broader sense are handled by Aristotle's *Politeiai*, and Plutarch used that source.

Miscellen.—6. pp. 472-476. E. Kornemann. Die Organisation der africanischen *pagi* bzw. *pagi et civitates*. Supplem. to art. XXIII.

7. pp. 476-477. L. Radermacher. Metrische Inschrift. Kaibel I Sic. et Ital. 664 is a short, two-verse dedicatory insc.

8. pp. 478-479. H. Goetz. Zu der Aretinischen Gefässform mit Szenen aus der Phaethonsage. Note on an art. by Hartwig in *Philologus*, 1899.

9. pp. 480. C. Hentze. Zu Odysee τ 524-529.

XXVII, pp. 481-490. A. Wilhelm. Vermuthungen. I. Thuk. IV 118, 5. II. Andokides *Myster.* 47. III. Josephos A. J. XIV. 8, 5 (149 ff.).

XXVIII, pp. 491-501. L. Radermacher. Griechischer Sprachgebrauch (Cont'd from *Philol.* N. F. XIII, p. 592). II. On the acc. form *σείς*. The case cited from Papyr. Rein. of the 6th cent. (*Wien. Stud.* IX. 260) is shown to be a mistake for *σεί* is. III. On the chemical papyrus (*Lugd.* II, p. 12, 12, p. 237, Leeman). IV. On *ἑξάλλος* and *ἑξάνθρωπος*. V. In the hymn to Apollo, 97 ff., Callimachus explains *ἡ ἡ παῖνον* by *ἡ βέλως*.

XXIX, pp. 502-509. C. Hentze. Zur Darstellung des Landlebens auf dem Achilles-Schild. 2 541-572. (1) The plowing, the harvest and the vintage scenes show the close of a rather long work-period, of a day or perhaps of the whole piece of work. This last seems especially true of the harvest scene. (2) The laborers in these scenes and the division of labor presupposed are discussed.

XXX, pp. 510-540. A. Brieger. Epikurs Lehre vom Raum, vom Leeren und vom All und die Lucrezischen Beweise für die Unendlichkeit des Alls, des Raumes und des Stoffes. He disagrees with Giussani's view of *inane* and *spatium*, also with his own former critique of Hoerschelmann's *Observationes Lucretianae Alterae* (1877) rev. in *Jhrbr.*, 1877, p. 65, and Susemihl (*Jen. Litt. Ztg.*, 1877, nr. 44, p. 635f.), which were too favorable acc. to his present view.

XXXI, pp. 541-571. K. Lincke. Xenophon's persische Politie. In the *Cyropaedia* I 2 15-16^a X. explains his *Cyrop.* as a manual of the existing Persian constitution as the model state of the time. By comparison with the other works of X. the writer concludes that the *Cynegeticus* and the attempt at a Persian constitution as the ideal of the present are really the works of Gryllus produced in the school of X. at Scillus. Later they received additions from his grandson Xenophon.

XXXII, pp. 572-578. R. Ehwald. Zu Lygdamus C. I. Textual notes. E. disagrees with Dziatzko in his "Untersuchungen über ausgewählte Capitel des antiken Buchwesens", p. 177 ff.

XXXIII, pp. 579-592. Fr. Wilhelm. Zu Tibullus I 8 and 9. On the relations of these poems to Greek originals.

XXXIV, pp. 593-600. J. Lezius. *Comperendinatio* bei Cicero pro Flacco? L. concludes that after the Verrine trial, i. e., after the *lex Aurelia*, we cannot trace with certainty any instance of *comperendinatio* in any criminal process.

XXXV, pp. 601-627. L. Gurlitt. Zu Ciceros Briefen. Critical notes. I. Ad Quint. fr. II. Ad fam. III. Ad Att. IV. Transpositions and losses in the text of epp. ad Att. (ad Att. IV 19; 18).

XXXVI, pp. 628-634. W. M. Lindsay. Die Handschriften von Nonius V-XX.

Miscellen.—10. p. 635. R. Ehwald. Horaz carm. II. 2 and 3. These illustrate Ep. I, 1. 16 ff.

11. p. 636. R. Ehwald. Tac. Agr. c. 10. The expression (*Brit.*) *in orientem Germaniae in occidentem Hispaniae obtenditur*, and c. 24, *Hibernia medio inter Britanniam atque Hispaniam sita* is neither geographically correct nor to be explained by literary parallels, but from cartographic representation such as might have been on a forerunner of the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, where similar distortions occur.

12. pp. 636-639. A. Frederking. Zu Cicero. Notes on 9 passages in *Tusc.*, *De Or.*, *Brut.*, *In Verrem* IV. 22. 49.

13. pp. 639-640. G. Knaack. Jordanes Rom. 241. A compilation from *Florus* (II. 22 = IV. 124), with the addition of the word *Teutonios*, which is worthless.

Indices.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

BRIEF MENTION.

The *editio princeps* of the *Persians* of *Timotheos* (New York, Lemcke and Büchner) is just now a topic of absorbing interest to all Hellenists (A. J. P. XXIV 110) and I will make no apology to the readers of the Journal for postponing to a calmer day other matter intended for the *Brief Mention* of this number. Unless I say what is on my mind now, I shall be shamed out of my impressionism; for I remember what Haussoullier said about the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία (A. J. P. XII 97), and recall my own experience with Herondas and Bakchylides. Three months hence it will be impossible to make the slightest observation about *Timotheos*, without consulting all the dreary literature, all the journals, all the programmes. Three months hence I shall have lost all desire to say anything about this treasure-trove. The air will be filled with the shouts of scholars claiming recognition *ἔξυπαρανδότη φωνᾷ παρακόπῃ τε δόξα φρενῶν* and there will be no room for my obviousnesses. Perhaps I shall repent then of what I have to say now; for *αἱ δευτεραί πως φροντίδες σοφώτεραι*. But the old saw is only partly true. The first impression made by a work of art is distinctly precious and is often worth more than the results of painful excogitation. The more one meditates, the more one is apt to sophisticate oneself. At all events I am going to set down certain things that forced themselves on me during the early hours of my acquaintance with this remarkable document. Early hours, I say, because little more than a day intervened between my first reading of the text as it appeared in the Independent of April 9, copied from the facsimile edition, and the arrival of the annotated edition, when the potent influence of WILAMOWITZ made itself felt. True, it had made itself felt already in the restorations that had been silently incorporated in the text; and the virginity of the eye was lost forever, *nulla reparabilis arte*. Still in the untroubled interval I had studied the piece for myself and some of those first impressions that have been confirmed by subsequent reflections may be worth the space I shall give them. The *editio princeps* of any such fragment is apt to be an *editio praeceps* and my unfeigned admiration for the learning and insight of the eminent editor has not blinded me to the hastinesses of his edition nor will it prevent me from giving my own interpretation when it diverges from his. For the convenience of my readers I will reproduce here what WILAMOWITZ has made out of the original and, as the text of the *Persians* in the facsimile edition has incorporated more of the editor's suggestions than has the annotated edition, my friend Professor MILLER has kindly harmonized the two and corrected some slight errors of the press.

THE ΠΕΡΣΑΙ OF TIMOTHEOS.¹

- [σ]ὺν [ἐμ]βόλοισι γαί[ονε]ς
 .. υ αντίαι
 πρι. [ἐ]νεχάρα-
 [ξ]αν πο[σ]ὶ δὲ γε[ισδ]λογχο[ν] 40
 δγ-
 5 κωμ(α)] ἀμφέθεντ(ο) ὀδόντων.
 στ .. αι δὲ κυρτοῖ[σι] κρασὶν [ἀμ-
 φεστεμ]μέναι
 χεῖρας παρέσυρον ἐλατίνας.
 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν [ἐ]νθ' ἐνδ(ε) [ἀ]προφάσι- 45
 στος ἐπ[ιφ]έροιτο πλαγὰ
 10 ῥηξί[ζυγ]ος, πάντες [ι]σαν ἐ-
 πὶ [δ]υσμ[ενεῖς] ἐνά[ν]ται·
 εἰ δ(ἐ) ἀντίτοιχος ἀκτ[ίς] προ[σ]ά[ξι]ξει-
 εμ, πολυκρότο[ν] [ῥ]ιπ[ι]σι [τ]ά-
 χα]
 πεύκας πάλιν ἐφέροντο,
 15 αἱ δὲ [περὶ π]ά[ν]τη γνῖα διαφέ-
 ρουσα[ι]
 [πλ]ευρὰς λι[νο]ζώστους ἐφαι-
 νον, τὰς [μελάν]δετον πτυχαῖς
 σκηπτ[δ]ον ἐπεμβάλλ[ο]ντες ἀνε-
 χ[α]ίτιζον, αἱ δὲ πρα[ν]εῖς ἐ-
 20 [κλίνοντο] δέμ[ας] ἀπηγλαῖ-
 σμένοι σιδα[ρ]εῖαι κράνει.
 ἴσος δὲ πυρὶ δαμ[ασί]φως
 Ἄρης] ἀγκυλένδετος
 μεθίετο χερσίν, ἐν δ' ἐπιπτε γνίους,
 25 αἶθε[ρο]φόρητον σ]ῶμα διακραδαίνων.
 στερεοπαγῇ δ' ἐφέρετο φόνι-
 α [μ]όλιβα π[ισσ]ά[εν]τά τε περί-
 βολα πυρὶ φλεγ[όμεν]α ἐν ἀπο-
 τομάσι βουδό[ροις].
 δφεσι δὲ] βίωτος ἐθέτ[ε] (ο)] ἀδι-
 30 ν[δ]ος ὑπὸ τανυπτέροις χαλ-
 κόκρassi νευρε[πεντάτοις].
 σμαραγδοχαίτας δὲ πόν-
 τος ἄλοκα ναίους ἐφου-
 νίσσето σταλα[γμοῖς].
 35 [κρ]ανγαῖ βοὰ δὲ [συμ]μ[ι]γῆς κατεῖ-
 χεν.
 ὁμοῦ δὲ ναίους στρατὸς
- βάρβαρος ἀμμι[γ]α αὐτίς] ἀν-
 τεφέρετ' ἐ[ν] ἰχ[θ]υ[σ]τεφέσει μαρ-
 μαροπ[τέρ]ο[ι]ς κόλποισιν [Ἀμ-
 φιτρί]ας· ἐνθα τοῖ τ[ίς] Φρυγιο]-
 πέδιος ἀνὴρ, ἀμερο-
 δρόμοιο χώρας ἀναξ
 [π]λάκ' ὁ]μβρίαν ἀ[ρ]ῶ[ν] σκέ-
 λεσι]
 χ]ερσίν τε παῖω[ν] ἐ]πλει νησιώ-
 45 τας [ἀνέμοις] θεινόμε[νος]
 [κ]υματοπληξ] [δ]ιεξόδους
 μ[ατεῶν].
 ἰσόρροπά τε παλενο[ν]-
 — — — — — ηλ —
 — — — — — ων [κ]άλει
 50 θ[αλά]σιον θεὸν πατέρα
 τ[ε] — — — — — νο . . . φι — —
 — — — — — κεπ — —
 — — — — — λασσων — —
 — — — — — σπ . . . τε — —
 55 — — — — — γαν . . . ον — — — — — α Περσῶν
 εφασ . . . ρ — —
 αντεκεκρατ νιν
 κελαι[ν] . . . [ἀμ]βλῶ δ' ὦ[χ]ρον—
 — — — — — ς κατεσ—
 60 σφρα[γισμέν] στα—
 πεπα . . . ολλ — —
 — — — — — υτεκ . . . τορ . . .
 νότον — —
 ε διαπαλεῖων
 65 — — — — — πον βάσιμον . .
 . . . ν δίοδον
 ἐσμ[δ]ς [ἀπ]ειρος — — —
 φιναιστρῶν [ἐ]λιχθείς
 — — — — — υλα — — — φον
 70 [πν]εῦμ(α). [δ] | τε δὲ τῇ λείπειεν
 αὔ-
 ραι, ταῖδ' ἐπεισέπιπτεν ἀ-
 φρώδης ἄβαχχίωτος δμ-
 βρος, εἰς δὲ τρόφιμον ἀγγορ
 ἐχεῖτ(ο). ἐπεὶ δ(ἐ) ἀμβόλιμος ἄλ-
 75 μα στόματος ὑπερέθυεν,

¹ Spaced type is used to indicate the restorations found only in the facsimile edition.

- ὄξυπαραυδότηι
 φωνᾷ παρακόπῳι
 τε δόξαι φρενῶν
 κατακορῆς ἀπειλεῖ,
 80 γόμοις ἐμπρίων
 μιμούμενος, λυμεῶ-
 νι σώματος θαλάσσαι·
 “ἤδη θρασεῖα καὶ πάρος
 λάβρον αὐχέν(α) ἔσχες ἐμ
 85 πέδαι κατασκευθεῖσα λινοδέτωι
 τεόν.
 νῦν δέ σ(ε) ἀναταράξει
 ἐμὸς ἀναξ, ἐμός,
 πεύκαισιν ὀριγόνουσιν, ἐγ-
 κλήσει δὲ πεδία πλόιμα νομάσιν
 αὐγαῖς.
 90 οἰστρομανῆς παλεομί-
 σημ(α) ἀπιστόν τ(ε) ἀγκάλι-
 σμα κλυσιδρομάδος αἰρας.”
 φάτ(ο) ἀσθματι στρευνόμενος,
 βλοσυρὰν δ(ἐ) ἐξέβαλλεν
 95 ἄχναν, ἐπαν(α)ερευνόμενος
 στόματι βρύχιον ἄλμαν.
 φυγαῖ δὲ πάλιν ἴετο Πέρ-
 σης στρατὸς { βάρβαρος } ἐπι-
 σπέρχων.
 ἄλλα δ(ἐ) ἄλλαν θραῦεν σύρτις,
 100 μακρανυχνόπλους
 χειρῶν δ(ἐ) ἐγβαλλον ὀρείους
 πόδας ναός. στόματος
 δ’ ἐξήλλοντο μαρμαροφεγ-
 γεῖς παῖδες συγκρούμενοι·
 105 κατὰστερος δὲ πόντος
 ἐγ λιποπνός ψυχαστερέσειν
 ἐγάργαυρε σώμασιν,
 ἐβρίθοντο δ(ἐ) αἰόνες.
 [οἶ] δ’ ἐπ’ ἄκταις ἐνάλοις
 110 ἤμενοι γυμνοπαγεῖς
 ἀντᾷ τε καὶ δακρυ-
 σταγεῖ [γ]ῶ[ι] στερνοκτύποι
 γοηταὶ θρηνώδει κατεῖχοντ’ ὀδυρμῶι,
 ἅμα δὲ [γᾶν] πατρίαν ἐπανε-
 115 κα[λ]ῆν(ο) “ἰὼ Μύσιαί
 δεινρόθειραι πτυχαί,
 [ρύσ]ασθὲ μ’ ἐνθέν[δ](ε), ἵν’ ἀή-
 ταις φερόμεθ(α)· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι ποτ’ ἄ-
 μὸν [σῶ]μα δέξεται [κύν]ις.
- 120 κ[ῦρ]εγ γὰρ χερὶ πα[λ]ε[ο]νυμ-
 φαγόνον [ἄβατ]ον ἄντρον
 ο διαστακαπε . . .
 . . . δονεῖτο βαθί[τ]ερον πόντοιο
 τ[έρμ]α.
 ἀπεχέ μ’, ἀχί μο[ι] κ[α]τὰ
 125 πλόιμον Ἑλλαν εὐ[παγ]ῇ στέγην
 ἐδειμε
 [τ]η[λετ]ελεσπόρον ἐμδς
 δεσπότης. οὐ γὰρ ἀ[ν] Τμῶ[ν] οὐδ(ἐ)
 ἄστν Λυδὸν [λι]πὼν Σάρδεων
 ἤλθον [Ἑ]λλαν’ ἀπέρξων Ἀ[ρη]
 130 νῦν δὲ πᾶι τις δυσέκφευκ[τ]ον εὐ-
 ρη | γλυκεῖαν μόρον καταφυγῇ;
 Ἰλιοπόρος κακῶν λυαί-
 α μόνα γένοιτ’ ἄν,
 εἰ δυνατόν πρὸς μελαμπεταλο-
 135 χίτωνα Ματρὸς οὐρεί-
 ας δεσπόσυνα γόνата πεσεῖν,
 εὐωλένους τε χεῖρας ἀμφέβαλλον
 λῦσον, χρυσοπλόκαμε θεᾷ
 Μᾶτερ ἱκνοῦμαι,
 140 ἐμὸν ἐμὸν αἰῶνα δυσέκ-
 φευκτον, ἐπεὶ με
 αὐτίκα λαιμοτόμῳ τις ἀποίσεται
 ἐνθάδε μήστορι σιδάρῳι,
 ἢ κατακνυμοτακῆς ναυσιφθόροι
 145 αἰραι νυκτιπαγεῖ βορέαι δια-
 ραίσονται· περὶ γὰρ κλύδων
 ἄγριος ἀνέρρηξεν ἅπαγ
 γνίων εἶδος ὕφαντόν,
 ἐνθα κείσομαι οἰκτρὸς ὄρ-
 150 νίθων ἔθνεσιν ὠμοβρῶσι θοινά.”
 Τοιάδ(ε) ὀδυρόμενοι κατεδάκρνον.
 ἐπεὶ δὲ τις λαβὼν ἄγοι
 πολυβότων Κελαινᾶν
 οἰκῆτορ(α) ὄρφανὸν μαχᾶν
 155 σιδαρόκωπος Ἑλλαν,
 ἀγεγ κόμης ἐπισπάσας,
 δ δ’ ἀμφὶ γόνασι περιπλεκεῖς
 ἐλίσσεται(ο) Ἑλλάδ’ ἐμπλέκων
 Ἀσιάδι φωνᾷ, διάτορον
 160 σφραγίδα θραῦν στόματος,
 Ἰάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξιχνεύων.
 “ἐγὼ μοί σοι κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμ(α),
 αὐτίς οὐδ’ ἄμ’ ἔλθω.
 καὶ νῦν ἐμὸς δεσπότης

- 165 δεῦρό μ' ἐνθάδ' ἦξε,
τὰ λοιπὰ δ' οὐκέτι πάτερ, οὐ-
κέτι μάχεσθ' αὐτίς ἐνθάδ' ἔρχω,
ἀλλὰ κάθω·
ἐγὼ σοι μὴ δεῦρ', ἐγὼ
- 170 κεῖσε παρὰ Σάρδι, παρὰ
Σοῦσ(α), Ἀγβάτανα ναίων.
Ἄρτιμος, ἐμὸς μέγας θεός,
παρ' Ἐφeson φυλάξει."
Οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ παλιμπορον φυ-
- 175 γην ἔθεντο ταχύπορον,
αὐτίκα μὲν ἀμφιστόμους
ἄκοντας ἐχ' χερῶν ἐρι-
πτον, ὀρύπτετο δὲ πρόσωπον ὀνυ-
χι, Περούδα στολὴν περὶ
- 180 στέρνοις ἔρεικον εὐνῆν,
σύντονος δ(ἐ) ἀρμόζετο
Ἄσιᾶς οἰμωγὰ.
πολυστῶναι κτῆπει δὲ πᾶ-
σα βασιλῆως πανήγυρις
- 185 φόβῳ, τὸ μέλλον εἰσορώμενοι πά-
θος.
καὶ παλινπύρευντον ὡς ἔσ-
εῖδε | βασιλεὺς εἰς φυγὴν ὀρ-
μῶντα παμμιγῇ στρατόν,
γονυπετῆς αἰκίζε σῶμα,
- 190 φάτο δὲ κυμαίνων τύχαισιν
"Ἴδ' κατασκαφαῖ δόμων
σεῖριαί τε νᾶες Ἑλλανίδες,
αἱ κατὰ μὲν ἡλικ(α) ὀλέσασ(ε) ἤ-
βαν νέων πολυάνδρον,
- 195 νᾶες δὲ — — —
οὐκ(ι) ὀπισσοπύρευντον ἄ-
ξουσιν, πυρὸς δ' αἰθαλόεμ
μένος ἀγρίῳ σώματι φλέ-
ξει, στονόεντα δ(ἐ) ἄλγη
- 200 ἔσται Περούδι χώραι.
ὦ βαρεῖα συμφορά,
ἃ μ' ἐς Ἑλλάδα(α) ἤγαγες.
ἀλλ' ἴτε μηκέτι μέλλετε ζεύγυντε
μὲν τετράπορον ἵππων
- 205 ὄχημ(α), οἱ δ(ἐ) ἀνάρηθμον ὀλ-
βον φορεῖτ' ἐπ' ἀπήνας,
πίμπρατε δὲ σκηνάς,
μηδέ τις ἡμετέρων
γένοιτ(ο) δνησις αὐτοῖσι πλοῦτου."
- 210 οἱ δὲ τρόπαια στησάμενοι, Διὸς
ἀγνότατον τέμενος, Παιᾶνα
ἐκελάδησαν, ἱήιον
ἄνακτα, σύμμετροι δ' ἐπεκτύπεον
ποδῶν
ὑψικρότοις χορείαις.
- 215 Ἄλλ' ὦ χρυσοκίθαριν ἀέ-
ξων μοῦσαν νεοτευχῇ
ἐμοῖς ἐλθ(ἐ) ἐπίκουρος ὕ-
μνοις ἰήιε Παιᾶν·
ὁ γάρ μ' εὐγενέτας μακραί-
ων Σπάρτας μέγας ἀγεμῶν,
- 220 βρύων ἀνθεσιν ἤβας,
δονεῖ λαὸς ἐπιφλέγων
ἐλαῖ τ(ε) αἰθοπι μῶμῳ,
ὅτι παλαιότεραν νέοις
225 ὕμνοις μοῦσαν ἀτιμῶ.
ἐγὼ δ(ἐ) οὔτε νέον τιν(ᾶ) οὐ-
τε γεραὸν οὐτ(ε) ἰσῆβαν
εἰργω τῶνδ' ἐκάς ὕμνων,
τοὺς δὲ μουσοπαλαιολύ-
- 230 μας, τούτους δ(ἐ) ἀπερύκω,
λωβητῆρας αἰοιδᾶν
κηρύκων λιγυμακροφώ-
νων τείνοντας ἰνγάς.
πρῶτος ποικιλόμονον Ὀρ-
235 φεὺς χέλυν ἐτέκνωσεν,
νῖος Καλλιόπας Πιερίας ἐπι.
Τέρπανδρος δ' ἐπὶ τῷ δέκα
ζεῦξε μοῦσαν ἐν ὠιδαῖς·
Λέσβος δ(ἐ) Αἰολία νιν Ἀν-
240 τίσσαι γείνατο κλεινόν·
νῖν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις
ῥυθμοῖς τ(ε) ἐνδοκακρουμάτοις
κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει,
θησαυρὸν πολύνυμον οἰ-
- 245 ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμεινόν·
Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἁ
θρέψας, ἃ | δωδεκατει-
χέος λαοῦ πρωτεύς ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν.
Ἄλλ' ἐκαταβόλε Πίθι, ἀγνὰν
250 ἔλθοις τάνδε πόλιν σὺν ὀλ-
βῳ, πέμπων ἀπήμονι λα-
ῶι τῷδ' εἰρήναν
θάλλουσιν εὐνομίαι.

The description of the Battle of Salamis in the Persians of Timotheos has no historical warrant such as one imagines in the Persians of Aischylos. It is doubtless accommodated to the normal sea-fight of Timotheos' time, the normal sea-fight of the Peloponnesian War. There was no more antiquarianism about Timotheos than there was about Pindar, who uses the *ἄγκυραι* of his day and not the *εὔναι* of the Argonautic age (P. 4, 24). In order to understand Timotheos we must read Thukydides and Xenophon and the other authorities for that period, and, as the Confederates reintroduced antique methods, not to say, antique valor, a man of my time is occasionally reminded of the performances of the Merrimac in the spring of 1862. So much for the time; and as for the place, the harbor of Syracuse will serve as well as the Bay of Salamis. The local touches amount to very little. 'Enwreathed with strings of fishes' will answer for Hampton Roads, and Norway is full of bays with rocky headlands 'that jut out like wings'. Technical terms are set at naught and the poet's only aim is to say the ordinary things in an extraordinary way, so that we are really grateful to him for using so familiar a word as *ἐμβόλοισι* (v. 1), which Pindar did not disdain. Elsewhere the homely ram is an *ἀντίτοιχος ἄκρῃς* (v. 12), a *σιδάρεον κράνος* (v. 21). In fact, the ram seems to be omnipresent. WILAMOWITZ recognizes it in the *σκηπτὸς* of v. 18, and I am surprised that he does not consider the puzzling *γε . . . λογχο . . . ὀδόντων* (v. 4 sq.) another avatar of the ram. At least, one of the prows figured in Baumeister (No. 1691) might be thought to look like WILAMOWITZ'S 'toothed cornice.' The oars are nowhere oars. Now they are 'feet,' *πόδες* (v. 4), for the ship 'walks the waters like a thing of life' and the true nautical *πούς* or 'sheet' is banished. Anon the oars are *χεῖρες ἐλάτιναι* (v. 7) for the ship is a swimmer as well and the true *σιδηραὶ χεῖρες* or 'grappling irons' are nowhere to be seen. The same oars are *πόδες* again, this time *δρειοὶ πόδες* (v. 102) and in v. 88 they are *πύλαι ὀρίγονοι*. In point of fact, we encounter from the start a series of *γρίφοι* such as Greek comedy delights in; and inasmuch as a great deal of our knowledge of antique nauticalities is guesswork, we have riddle within riddle and an Oedipus like WILAMOWITZ will be welcome to those who hate conundrums.

Still, even unaided by restorations, we can make out something of the course of events. So v. 8 there can be very little doubt that a front attack is delivered, ship against ship, *ἀντίπρωροι ἐμβαλλόμεναι* (Thuk. 7. 34, 5) ram against ram, man against man.—The indications of boarding are not very plain, for this is not the way in which hostile ships are usually boarded, but for all that, we must consider WILAMOWITZ'S paraphrase as a possibility: *πάντες οἱ ναῦται ἐπὶ τὴν πολεμίαν ναῦν ἐπιδιαβῆναι ἐπειρώντο*.—A side attack is threatened and the opposing ships back water. We have a

vision of ships that go apart or drift apart and show their linen girths; of a 'thunderbolt,' ram or haply dolphin, that plunges into the hold with a blow that makes the vessels toss the head, that makes them capsize. We have a vision of ships sinking by the prow or haply turning over on the side, shorn of the glory of their oarage by the iron skull-cap of the ram.—*ὑπὸ τῆς σιδηρᾶς . . . κεφαλῆς ἀποβαλοῦσαι*, says the paraphrast, but there is no causal nexus and *ἀποβεβληκυίας* would have been nearer the mark.—Darts are sped like fire or lightning and fall, quivering as they fly, into the hull, into the hold of the ship. Fiery balls are sent into the enemy's vessels and many a life is lost beneath the shower of arrows. The green-haired sea is em-purpled by the droppings of the ships, whether sparks of fire or gouts of blood. Yelling and shouting rule the scene (v. 35).—'Green-haired' is a rare epithet for the antique sea. Green, thinks W., is the complementary color to the red sparks. *ἰφουίσστρο* of blood does not need a chromatic commentary.¹

The barbaric fleet holds on its course to meet the enemy in the bay, a fishy bay, a rocky bay.—*ἰχθυ(σ)στεφείσι*, if rightly restored, is little more than *ἰχθυόεσι*. The latter part of compounds is often almost otiose and must not be pressed.—Suddenly a man of the plain appears,—a Phrygian, says the paraphrast, but we have one Phrygian below and this man, for aught we know, may be a Philistine, for the Philistines were emphatically men of the plain, as are their modern namesakes. Well, Phrygian or Philistine, he appears swimming for his life, a continental become an islander, and tries to get out of the turmoil. Soon lost amid the wreckage of the text, he emerges again to eject the salt water he is forced to swallow and gives Timotheos an opportunity to glorify what some superfine writers of our day call by the grand old name of 'parbreak'. And as he vomits, he reviles the sea in high-pitched tone and maddened mood, grinning defiance at her whom his lord had once bound and will yet lash with his oars and control with his eye (Ps. 32, 8: I will guide thee with mine eye). And now the Persian fleet is in full flight and the vessels crash into each other in their mad swirl and 'knock the feet of the ships out of the hands of the rowers', and the gleaming teeth—the rowlocks—fly out of the mouth, out of the red gunwale (*χεῖλος*) of the vessel (v. 104).—We breathe more freely and thank Diels for solving the puzzle. *σκαλμός*, it seems, was too commonplace a word for Timotheos, but seven years ago it thrilled me to hear it still used in Greek waters.—The sea swarms with constellations of bodies that have lost the breath of life

¹In solchem Zusammenhange kann schwerlich etwas anders gemeint sein als das von den Schiffen ins Meer strömende ("tropfende") Menschenblut.—DANIELSSON, p. 13.

(unless one makes a new word and reads *κατάστροφος*, and combines it with *ἐγ' λιποπνότης*, as Professor MILLER has suggested, cf. v. 70), and the shores are loaded down therewith. The stranded survivors beat upon their breasts and fill the air with lamentations calling upon the wooded vales of Mysia to save them, deploring the lack of fit burial, yearning for the sight of the bridge that brought them far from their native land. There can be but one redeemer, the Great Mother, nay, could have been. Too late! Too late! And yet there is an urgent appeal for salvation, followed by a gloomy vision of death by the sword, by the wild winds, by the wild waves, and the end—to be devoured by the fowls of the air (v. 150).

A comic scene ensues. A man from Kelainai is fished up by the hair of his head, embraces the knees of his captor and breaks silence in broken Greek, broken past mending at first but his meaning gets plainer as he goes on. 'I—to me—to thee—how?—and—what matter? It is my master that brought me hither. Never, great father, will I come to fight thee again. I will stay peaceably at home, Sardis, Susa, Ecbatana. Great is Diana of the Ephesians. He, she, it will be my protector.'—One's memory goes back to the Anabasis, that bugbear of schoolboys, and to Kelainai, the inhabited city, great and prosperous, where Cyrus had a palace and a park full of wild beasts, and to the river Marsyas, five and twenty feet broad, and to Apollo's luckless rival. One wonders whether Timotheos had a special spite against Kelainai above all the towns of Phrygia.—Of course, on WILAMOWITZ'S theory the mountain Phrygian is an offset against the *Φρυγιονέδιος* of v. 40 and the Philistine's chances are reduced to nothing, in fact, never did amount to anything; and I make the *amende honorable* to those Philistines who thought otherwise. As the iterative optative shows, *ἐπεὶ* (= *ὅποτε*) *δέ τις λαβὼν ἄγοι*, this Kelainite is only one of a succession of captives, and, apart from the language, there could be nothing more farcical than this fishing scene in which barbarian after barbarian is hauled up by the hair of his head, the long hair so characteristic of the enemy. It is the comic side of the *βαθυχαιτήεις Μῆδος* of Aischylos. The Kelainite is the spokesman for reasons best known to Timotheos, but we must imagine the other captives falling in at the end and saying, 'I live by (= in) Sardis, I by Susa, I by Ecbatana' (v. 170).

Meantime, the suite of the King drop their javelins and tear their faces with their nails, rend their garments and intone in unison an Asiatic lament. About the King there gathers a

groaning crowd, and the King himself, when he sees his fleet fleeing in wild disarray, falls on his knees, does despite to his body, and bewails the desolation of his house, the loss of the flower of his men, whom he shall never lead back. Fierce flames of fire shall devour them and groans and anguish be the lot of Persia. An evil day it was that brought him to Greece. No more delay. Yoke the chariot. Pile the uncounted treasure on the wains. Burn the tents that those people may get no good out of our wealth. But the Greeks set up a trophy in honour of Zeus and raise a song of triumph to Apollo and dance a lilting dance of victory. Such is the substance of the *ὀμφαλός*, the narrative.

The *σφραγίς*, in which the poet sets the seal to his work, begins with an appeal to Apollo, whom he beseeches to favor his new-fashioned song, his *μοῦσαν νεοτευχῇ*. Wherein that innovation consisted does not concern us just now. The claim of novelty is the main thing poetically and we are weary of it. It is as old as Homer and Hesiod. It was old when Pindar bragged of his *νεοσίγαλος τρόπος*. Aristophanes prides himself on the daring novelty of ending a comedy with a dance and Eupolis chides his detractors as does Timotheos. We are familiar with the 'Nullius ante trita solo' of Lucretius, with Milton's 'Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme' and Platen's 'Frei steht die Folge jedem. Ich fliege voran'. We wax as tired of epoch-making poets as of epoch-making grammarians and turn to ask, What are we to say of this great discovery?

After all, the disillusion as to 'old Timotheos' is not very startling. Athenaeus tells slighting stories about him, and the diction of the few fragments previously known has been pronounced 'vapid and contorted'. Will that verdict be changed? To be sure, the vapidness is not so evident at first, when one takes in eagerly the unfamiliar vintage. But of the contortion there can be little question. To be frank, no adult person who is fairly familiar with Greek poetry will be carried away with this specimen of the poetic power of Timotheos. Somehow the word *νόμος* has always exercised an imposing effect even on scholars. They read into its early occurrences all the majesty we ascribe to Law; and they have a respect for the musical *νόμος* that they would not have for 'tune'. So the Terpandrian *νόμος* with its seven parts was likened to the seven lamps of the golden candlestick; and once upon a time the Pindaric student that did not recognize the Terpandrian *νόμος* in the Epinikian Odes (Pindar I. E. xlix) was under the same condemnation that made an end of Uzzah, who took hold of the ark of the Lord. For my part, the first impression made by the *κιθαρωδικός*

νόμος on my irreverent mind was comic rather than otherwise, and even the speech of the Shah with its impatient present imperatives reminded me of a similar cumulation in the Acharnians (S. C. G. § 405), whereas it ought to have reminded me of Aischyl. P. V. 56 foll. For this happens to be the Aristophanic year in my cycle, and, though the illustrious editor to whom we owe this new debt of gratitude and admiration, repeatedly rebukes in advance any semblance of levity, any cheap fun at the expense of Timotheos, my environment is too much for me. Nor am I wholly without defence. The easiest approach to this Akropolis of poetry, as to the real Akropolis, lies through the deme of Kydathenaion, the deme of Aristophanes. Nay, Köhler and Wilamowitz himself think that Kydathenaion and Akropolis are one; and those who take the aesthetics of Aristophanes so seriously, ought not to complain of the appeal to his decision here. Again we hear the rapid notes of the shivering, not to say frosty, poet who hails the founding of Nephelokokkygia. Again we breathe the atmosphere of the mock lyrics of the Birds, of the Frogs; and the triple compounds, πρόσθε λέων, ἔπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα, remind us of the cockinesses, the 'horse-cockinesses' of Aristophanes' comic fabrications, for in this regard the dithyramb at its worst was not worse than the κιθαρωδικὸς νόμος of Timotheos. μελαμπεταλοχίτων, to cite no other example, belongs to the same poetical wardrobe as σκοτοδασυπικνύθριξ. Designedly comic is the figure of the barbarian suppliant, who furnishes a pendant to the Δατισμός of the Peace (v. 289) and recalls the Scythian archer of the Thesmophoriazusae. What would one not give for a dialogue between the lover of Artamuxia and the Asiatic Parolles of Timotheos. It would be as good as a discussion between Dr. Caius and Sir Hugh Evans. Of the metres I must renounce any judgment. I have no hope of reweaving myself, as old Lobeck said when he was urged to study Sanskrit, and as one who followed Westphal and Schmidt a generation ago into what was then the Celestial City and is now considered the Fool's Paradise of symmetry, as one who refused to obey the voice of Hephaestion and made merry over Dindorf's *olla podrida* of Greek metres, I feel that my best course is to keep silent about the lilting measures of Timotheos lest I be guilty of a return to the once familiar name of logaoedic.

The poem is lively enough. The κιθαρωδικὸς νόμος must have been a law unto itself in the blending of the different departments of literature, and I should find it very hard to register the syntactical phenomena of Timotheos under any of the stylistic categories recognized in my Greek Syntax. But when I turn to consult my oracle, I find that there are no departments of literature left; and, seated high on the ruins of the Persians, WILAMOWITZ

laughs to scorn the traditional division into epic, lyric and dramatic. 'Wer von griechischer Poesie irgend was verstehen will, muss die allerdings überhaupt schlechthin unbrauchbare Dreiteilung der Schulästhetik in Epik, Lyrik, Dramatik fahren lassen' (p. 105). This is sad news for me. I listened with resignation when the great scholar intoned my favorite dirge, τὸ μηδὲν εἰς οὐδὲν ῥέπει (A. J. P. IX 84), over the Terpandrian controversy, but this is a more serious matter. 'Mir zerbricht mein frühes Leben Unter den Händen wie Knabenspielzeug'. However, I recognize the voice of fate and behold an omen, an *oionós*, in the facsimile of Timotheos. Between the *ὀμφαλός* and the *σφραγίς* is a figure that looks more like a bird than anything else.¹ Can it be, can it be an ibis out of drawing? The bird would suit the Egyptian habitat, and Robinson Ellis has set forth its unlovely ways in his Prolegomena to Ovid's poem (A. J. P. III 89). Ibis-like, Timotheos has swallowed and digested all the departments of Greek poetry, epic, lyric, dramatic. But, honestly, I do not think that they have been improved by the process. To be sure, if we had the music, everything would be plain (A. J. P. XVI 394). But we haven't the music, and it is small comfort to beat time and hum τοφλαττοθρατ.

And here I might plead lack of space and content myself with the safe generalities in which I have indulged thus far, but it seems a duty to the younger generation of scholars to illustrate what I meant in the beginning of these desultory remarks by the virginity of the eye. Read the Oidipus of Sophokles and you can remember no other plot. Read WILAMOWITZ's reconstructions and it is with great difficulty that you can recall what the attitude of your mind was when you read the text independently.² Take one of the first connected passages that emerge from the wreck of the Persians (vv. 15-21) which WILAMOWITZ paraphrases thus: ὅσαι δὲ καταθραυσθεισῶν τῶν κωπῶν (which, by the way, Professor More in the Independent renders as if it were τῶν καταθραυσθεισῶν κωπῶν, to the utter demolition of the sense) δεῦρο κἀκεῖσε φερόμεναι τὰς πλευρὰς τὰς διαζώμασι περιελημμένας ἐγύμνου, ταύτας κεραυνοῦ τρόπον τὸ ἔμβολον ἐναράττοντες ἀνέτρεπον ὥστε προνεύουσai κατεδύνοντο, τὸ τῆς κατασκευῆς κάλλος ὑπὸ τῆς σιδηρᾶς τοῦ

¹ Es wird doch wohl ein zu einem Vogel stilisiertes Zeichen sein, das die Funktion der späteren Koronis erfüllt; ob es eine ist und eine Krähe vorstellen will, lasse ich dahingestellt; über diese Äusserlichkeit wird wohl noch viel geredet werden.—WILAMOWITZ, p. 8.

² These reproductions of my first impressions were partly in the hands of the printer, partly on the way thither, when, on the eighteenth of May, Professor BLOOMFIELD handed me an advance copy of DANIELSSON's *Zu den Persern des Timotheos* in the Upsala Eranos for 1903. Our interpretations coincide at a number of points, and their absolute independence may serve as an illustration of my thesis, the value of fresh vision.

πλήκτρον κεφαλῆς ἀποβαλοῦσαι. 'Es ward beschrieben', he says (p. 57), 'welche Folgen die verschiedenen Stösse hatten, wie das Schiff nach dem Verluste der Ruderreihe dem Feinde die wehrlose Seite bot, den Stoss erhielt, kenterte, mit dem Vordertheile voran sank'. This is very plausible. But let us examine the text in detail.

What is γυῖα? What is διαφέρουσαι? And what does γυῖα διαφέρουσαι mean? And remember above all that there is no *περί πάντη* in the papyrus. The γυῖα cannot be 'hands and feet.' It may be 'tiers' or 'wales' (compare the Pindaric ὑψίγυιον ἄλσος O. 5, 13), but the use of the word elsewhere points to the body of the ship, whether waist or hold. Lyric poetry like epic avoids the reflexive and prefers more concrete forms (Pind. P. 4, 173) and it requires no argumentation to show that γυῖα διαφέρουσαι is = διαφερόμεναι. But there is more than one διαφέρειν and in the absence of *περί πάντη* the uninstructed soul might have thought first of the meaning 'rend apart', might have thought first of γυῖα λένυτο, might have translated γυῖα διαφέρουσαι into *δυστάμεναι* or haply *κεχηγυῖαι*, might have remembered Vergil's fleet after a storm (Aen. 1, 122): *Laxis compagibus omnes | accipiunt inimicum imbrem* (our *δμβρον ἀβαχχίωτον* v. 72) *rimaeque fatiscunt*. 'The shattered ships display their linen girths' and this may be due to the impact of the ever active ram. But WILAMOWITZ tells us that these girths were made visible by the shearing off of the oarage, but really, in the present state of controversy about the *διάζωμα* and the *ὑπόζωμα*, I am not prepared to say whether this explanation is even plausible. The sides of the vessels are clearly to be seen between the oars in all Baumeister's figured monuments; and one would have imagined these girths neatly covered up with planks except when repairs were hastily made as in Acts 27, 17: *βοηθείαις ἐχρῶντο ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον*. Next, what is the nature of the *σκηπτός*? Literally, it means 'thunderbolt' and though it is unfair to insist on a natural expression in Timotheos, a thunderbolt naturally falls and *ἐπεμβάλλοντες* leads one naturally to think of missiles projected from above and first of the familiar *δελφίνες μολύβδινοι*, for *δελφίς* is hog-fish and the Greeks call 'hog-fish of lead' what we call 'pigs of lead'. Surely no classical scholar will need to be referred for these *δελφίνες* to the scholiasts on Thuk. 7, 41 and Ar. Eq. 762. Now, conjecture for conjecture, is not *μολύβδινον* as good as *μελάνδετον*?¹ The next passage is still more puzzling. Accept the restored parts of *πρα[νὲς] ἐ[κλίνοντο δέμ]ας* and I am free to confess that untaught by WILAMO-

¹So wird der Dichter nicht vom Rammstoss gesprochen haben; dagegen passt der Ausdruck vorzüglich auf den zerschmetternden Wurf des *δελφίς* genannten 'Fallklotzes'. Somit hätte man in V. 17 τὰς [δὲ und danach etwa z. B. *μολύβδινον πτυχαίς* 'den bleiernen Wetterschlag' zu ergänzen.—DANIELSON, p. 13.

WITZ I should not have elicited from *πρανές* the meaning *προνεύουσαι κατεδύοντο*. An *ὀρθή ναῦς* is a ship on even keel. The opposite is *ὑπτία* as in Soph. Antig. 717: *ὑπτίοις κάτω | στρέψας τὸ λοιπὸν σέλμασιν ναυτίλλεται*. To be sure, with a human being *πρηγής* and *ὑπτιος* are opposed to each other, but starboard and port are symmetrical so that *πρανές* as the reverse of *ὀρθόν* may be equivalent to *ὑπτιον*, and uninstructed I should have fancied that *πρανές ἐκλίνοντο δέμας* meant that the ships were on their beam-ends. True, the pictorial sequence evoked by WILAMOWITZ is very satisfactory and he can cite for the second *αἱ δὲ* as referring to the subject of the preceding sentence such authorities as Herodotos and Xenophon. But this is not Attic syntax nor is it Timothean syntax (cf. vv. 157, 174, 205, 210) and one's first impression is in favor of rendering the second *αἱ δὲ*, 'yet others'; and 'yet others' would spoil the WILAMOWITZIAN sequence. And then *αἱ δὲ* stirs another question. Why should we not read with Professor MILLER *τὰς δὲ* and assume three sets of ships, ships with gaping sides, ships sinking under the crushing weight of the *δελφίς*, ships on their beam-ends?¹ Observe the parallelism of the three imperfects and the unnaturalness of the relative construction here.

The Persians of Timotheos is not high poetry, but it is at all events high-strung poetry, and the chords of our responsive lyre must be screwed up. Of the parts of the Terpandrian νόμος we have here the *ὀμφαλός* and the *σφραγίς*; and the *ὀμφαλός*, which carries the narrative, is fearfully corrugated and the interpreter must often do violence to his imagination. But Timotheos can be as simple as the most simple. There is nothing more direct in literature than the speech of the Shah, and if I dare mention syntax in a number that groans under syntax, the syntax of Timotheos is perfectly normal where it is not childishly simple, as it is in his tiresome *δέ—δέ—δέ* parataxis. There is one 'mixed condition', it is true. But it occurs in a highly emotional passage and can easily be defended, even if such shifts were not common in sentences of comparison. The speaker begins (v. 132) with something feasible and finds as he goes on that it is hopeless: *Ἰλιοπόρος κακῶν λυαία μόνα γένοιτ' ἂν, εἰ δυνατὰ* (sc. *ἦν*) *πρὸς μελαμπεταλοχίτωνα Ματρὸς οὐρείας δεσπόσυνα γόνατα πεσεῖν, εὐωλένους τε χεῖρας ἀμφέβαλλον*. Cf. Eur. I. T. 447: *ἦδιστ' ἂν τήνδ' ἀγγελίαν δεξαίμεσθ'*, *Ἑλλάδος ἐκ γὰρ πλωτήρων εἴ τις ἴβη*, the pathos of which is recognized by the editors. If, then, the ordinary interpretation gives a good sense, I do not see why we should resort to the strained, the violent, the obscure. The enraged swimmer, WILAMOWITZ'S [*Φρυγιο*] *πέδιος*, apostrophizes the sea (v. 90), as his *οἰστρομανὲς παλεομίσσημα*, as his 'frantic pet

¹ Also ist auch das erste *αἱ δὲ* demonstrativ und drei Fälle des Verunglückens zu unterscheiden.—DANIELSSON, p. 12.

aversion', as the ἀπιστον ἀγκάλισμα αἵρας, as the 'faithless minion of the breeze'. Is this nonsense, as WILAMOWITZ would have us to believe? Fire and water are natural enemies—Ag. 650 f.: ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρὶν, | πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα—but wind and wave are something more than alliterative allies. They are comrades, they are partners in mischief. The Greek, who loved the sea, was prone to put the blame on the winds, as we learn from Solon, ἐξ ἀνέμων δὲ θάλασσα ταρασσεται ἦν δὲ τις αὐτὴν | μὴ κινῇ, πάντων ἐστὶ δικαιοσύνη; and Herodotos foists the same Greek sentiment on a Persian (7, 16), but here the two go together and are alike guilty. More commonly the wind (ἀνεμος) is the man and the sea (θάλασσα) is the woman. The winds are masculine, and woman and the sea have been one for ages. Why rattle citations? to use WILAMOWITZ's phrase. But sometimes the sea is masculine. So in later times when Ὠκεανός, the river became Ὠκεανός, the Ocean. πόντος has an ἄρσιν κτύπος and αἶρα and θύελλα are feminine. In Timotheos both the mischief-makers are feminine, Rosalind and Celia. But, says WILAMOWITZ, the wind is not apostrophized. Of course not. It is the sea that is 'the hugging-piece of the breeze'. But the wind does not hug, says WILAMOWITZ. What of Boreas and Oreithyia in the Phaidros of Plato, what of Alkaios's Zephyros and Iris, what of Milton's Zephyr and Aurora? The winds not only visit, as Shakespeare has it, and caress and toy, but they hug—and worse; and as I write, my eye falls on Henley's 'Speed'. 'Speed', he sings, 'and the hug of God's winds. Speed and the play of God's airs'. WILAMOWITZ says that he cannot translate Timotheos; he can only paraphrase him into scholiastic Greek. Of course, when the master translator gives it up (A. J. P. XIII 517), where shall the mere botcher appear? And yet I venture to say that 'faithless minion of the breeze' is fairly comprehensible,¹ and at all events does not require an unheard-of syntactical juggle with the genitive such as Timotheos gives us no warrant for suspecting and such as WILAMOWITZ's paraphrase postulates: προδοτικῶς με περιβάλλουσιν θάλασσαν μετ' αἵρας οὕτω ταχέως ἐπερχομένης ὥστε με κατακλύσαι.

In v. 159: διάτορον σφραγίδα θραύων στόματος, ἰάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξ-
 ιχνεύων WILAMOWITZ interprets the διάτορος σφραγὶς στόματος as = τὸ
 εὖ ἐξάκουστον τοῦ στόματος σύμβολον (τὸ συνετὸν τοῦ λόγου). The 'clear
 stamp of the mouth' is 'distinct utterance' which is 'broken by
 this braiding of Greek with Asiatic speech.' But according to

¹ ἀγκάλισμά τινος heisst ja was jemand in die Arme nimmt und darin trägt, übertragen also, sein 'Hätschelkind, Liebling', wie Lykophron 308 der junge Troilos τερπνὸν ἀγκάλισμα συγγόνων genannt wird: und nichts ist natürlicher als die, wenn ich mich recht entsinne, auch der modernen Dichtung ganz geläufige Anschauung dass Wind und Welle Buhlen seien.—DANIELSSON, p. 19.

WILAMOWITZ Timotheos thought that this phrase needed explanation and so he added 'ἰάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξιχνεύων. This interpretation can hardly be called convincing. The σφραγὶς στόματος would naturally mean 'silence' which the barbarian breaks or crushes into penetrating utterance, διάτορον being used proleptically = ὥστε διάτορον εἶναι.¹ Tragic poetry is full of this figure and it would be impertinent to cite examples. Bruhn has collected a considerable number of them in his 'Anhang zu Sophokles' (pp. 5, 6) and others will be found in the Index to my Pindar. On this theory the man of Kelainai would match the Φρυγιοπέδιος ἀνὴρ in his ὀδυπαρاندίῳ φωνῇ and that would be quite in the manner of Timotheos who is perpetually varying the same theme. For the use of σφραγίς, cf. Anth. P. 10, 42: ἀρρήτων ἐπέων γλώσση σφραγίς ἐπικείσθω | κρείσσω γὰρ μύθων ἢ κτεάνων φυλακή.

Not being acquainted with the Phrygian language except so far as Kretschmer teaches it in his 'Einleitung', I am unable to criticize Timotheos's Phrygian Greek (v. 162). The first words: ἐγὼ μοί σοι κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμ(α) are rendered thus: ἔγωγε σός εἰμι· πῶς δέ; καὶ τί τὸ πρᾶγμα; μοι is puzzling. A barbarian who had heard ἐγώμηναι might readily make a crasis of ἐγὼ εἰμι and σοί for σός would be a very likely turn, if he had picked up his Greek from a Kolophonian acquaintance (A. J. P. XXIII 22). The next words are not so simple as they seem. The speaker is bewildered. He is feeling his way through the Ionic dialect and promptly loses it; for the vulgar Ionic κῶς is succeeded by the Attic πρᾶγμα, an inconsistency that may be set down to supreme art or else to a blunder of the scribe. Here WILAMOWITZ's paraphrase is not so helpful as usual: πῶς δέ; καὶ τί τὸ πρᾶγμα; the δέ is doubtless inserted in deference to the feelings of the imaginary paraphrast but the asyndeton is more dramatic; and the article does not help the situation, for τί τὸ πρᾶγμα, 'what's the matter'? is not a natural address in the circumstances. We expect some such question as that of the jailor at Philippi: τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν; and πρᾶγμα in the sense of *opus*, the wretched Kelainite might have learned from Herodotos. τί πρᾶγμα, therefore, is τί πρακτέον and this is the sense that the translator in the Independent has given it, regardless of the Greek paraphrase. 'What is to be done', 'what is wanted', 'what's your will'? One is reminded of Haimon's professed subservience to his father's will: πάτερ, σός εἰμι· καὶ σύ μοι γνώμας ἔχων χρηστὰς ἀπορβοῖς, αἷς ἔγωγ' ἐφέψομαι. Another solution, which had crossed my own mind, is suggested by Professor MILLER. The

¹ Den Siegel seines Mundes bemüht sich der Phryger zu durchbrechen, indem er so gut es eben gehen will, ionisch zu sprechen versucht. διάτορος wird proleptisches Prädikativ sein.—DANIELSSON, p. 38.

remarks, but as his treatment is so radically different from mine it seemed best to append here a brief review of the results reached by him.

The text as constituted by Wilamowitz is as follows :

ὦ φανείς χάρμα μοι φίλον, ὅτε μ' ἠγάπας,
ὅτε δόρατι πολεμῶν τὰν Φρυγῶν πόλιν ἐπόρθεις μόνα
τὰμὰ κομίσαι θέλων λέχεα πάλιν εἰς πάτραν.
νῦν δὲ μούναν μ' ἄφεις ἄλοχον, ἄστοργ', ἄπεις,
ἦν Δαναΐδαν λόχος ἔμολεν <' Ἀρήιος μέτα, >
ἧς ἔνεκα παῖδα τὰν ἄγαμον εἶλ' Ἀρτεμις,
τὸν σφάγιον Ἀγαμέμνονι.

Wilamowitz thinks that the verses were originally tetrameters, "denn", to use his own words, "in dem zweiten Verse, der jetzt ein Pentameter ist, steht ein sinnloses μόνα, und die Verderbnis ist stark." It is not apparent whether the remark "und die Verderbnis ist stark" is intended to apply to the whole fragment, or simply to the second verse. The former supposition would account for the presence, in the first verse, of the proceleusmaticus φίλον ὅτε, for, surely, one would hardly think of a φίλον and still less of an ε lengthened either before the μ or under the influence of the ictus. But to pass on to "sinnloses μόνα", why "sinnlos"? Helen imputes to Menelaus the desire of wishing to convey *her* (= τὰμὰ λέχεα) *alone* (μόνα) to his home. In other words *she* was his *sole* object; the *only desire* he had was to get *her* back home. We understand the thought better by applying the qualifier to the verb, the Greeks understood it quite as well with the qualifier attached to the object. There is no need of striking out, or of emending, the μόνα. In verse 5, W. agrees with me in supplying μέτα, but differs in the position accorded to it in the verse; and, instead of his metrically unpalatable Ἀρήιος, our conjecture shows a γε. In the last line, W. thinks of iambic verse, but states that even with the omission of the article this verse makes no sense, "oder was sollte der Dativ?" And yet, there is no serious difficulty about the dative. σφάγιον is in apposition with παῖδα, and σφάγιον Ἀγαμέμνονι means 'a victim, an offering, for Agamemnon, i. e. something that served as a victim, an offering, for Agamemnon, i. e. an object for Agamemnon to slaughter, offer'. Ἀγαμέμνονι is but an ordinary dative of the "person to or for whom". Of course, Iphigenia was not actually slaughtered by Agamemnon (Eur. I. T. 26 ff.), but, as Iphigenia herself says (vv. 175 ff.): τηλόσε γὰρ δὴ σᾶς ἀπενάσθην | πατρίδος καὶ ἐμᾶς, ἔνθα δοκήμασι | κεῖμαι σφαχθεῖς' ἃ τλάμων. For the dative compare vv. 241 ff.: ἤκουσιν εἰς γῆν . . . | . . . δίπτυχοι νεανῖαι, | θεᾷ φίλον πρόσφαγμα καὶ θυτήριον | Ἀρτέμιδι, and 209 ff.: ἀν' πρωτόγονον θάλος . . . | Λήδας ἃ τλάμων κούρα | σφάγιον πατρώα | καὶ θυμ' οὐκ εὐγάθητον | ἔτεκεν κτέ., and, indeed, the phrase σφάγιον πατρώα λώβα of the latter passage was probably hovering in the mind

of the author of our fragment, the style of which is characterized by Wilamowitz as "ausgeleierter tragischer Stil".

For my view of the rhythmical composition, compare Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 665-675 = 692-701. The ode and antode, which are paeonic, comprise four periods each. The first period consists of a paeonic hexameter (= 2 trimeters), the second period is an octameter, the third is composed of two tetrameters, and in the fourth there is a return to the hexameter (= 2 trimeters), with a trimeter following. Compare also Pax, 354-360 = 592-600 and *ibid.* 393-399, in each of which passages a paeonic hexameter is followed by a trochaic tetrameter, which is, in turn, succeeded by another paeonic hexameter, plus a trimeter. While, of course, none of the passages above cited, is the exact parallel of ours, they all show a grouping of cola of three feet around cola of four feet and they afford ample warrant for the rhythmical structure presented by me. It would appear, then, that our fragment is not nearly so corrupt as Wilamowitz would have us believe, and by supplying the words *γε μέγα* after *ἦν* and removing the *τὸν* before *σφάγιον*, the first of the Tebtunis fragments is reduced to a state, which, from a critical, exegetical, syntactical and rhythmical point of view, seems unassailable.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY:

Dear Sir:—I shall be grateful if you will announce in your next number that I have undertaken to write and edit the "Life and Letters" of the late Prof. E. B. COWELL, of Cambridge, and that it will be published by Macmillan & Co. There are probably many admirers of my cousin and even pupils amongst your readers from whom I am anxious to obtain the loan of letters, and who would be willing and glad to lend them to help to make the life interesting and complete. I need not say that I will take great care of and return any papers with which I may be entrusted.

24 HARRINGTON GARDENS, LONDON, S. W.,
May 21, 1903.

GEORGE COWELL.

NECROLOGY.

THOMAS RANDOLPH PRICE.

The seventh of May, 1903, closed a career of singular importance for the philological life of America. What THOMAS RANDOLPH PRICE did for the study of English, the favorite province of a scholar who commanded many, calls for a more competent chronicler than I am. What he was to a large circle of friends no one can feel more deeply than I do. And yet though thus doubly disqualified for an adequate and a calm appreciation of the true man and the admirable scholar, who has been removed from the life that now is, I cannot leave wholly to others the estimate of what America has gained by his life, has lost by his death. If he had been a voluminous writer, it might have sufficed to point to his published works, but in spite of all the urgency of his friends and admirers he could seldom be prevailed on to appear in print. Gem after gem was tossed with lordly lightness into drawer and pigeon-hole; and he seems to have held with Herder that authorship is only too apt to make the head a waste and the heart a void. Years ago he wrote to me that he was first and last a teacher and that his after life was to be lived on in his pupils; and surely no master ever impressed on his disciples more strongly the stamp of his own idealism. Every element in the composite structure of the English language and literature was to be studied in its historical and linguistic aspects. Not only the ancient classics, not only the contributions of the Romanic peoples. The Norse strain was to be traced in Norseland itself, and living Frisia was to yield him the secret of an earlier England that had passed away. The breadth of his reading was marvellous. Nor was its intensity less so. His studies were minute even to the small dust of statistics; and I have often been surprised to find that in my own field of research he had accumulated and digested a host of details, which, having once served their purpose and given up their ultimate meaning, had been consigned to silence. No sphere of literature, of history, was alien to him, and what he learned, he reproduced with artistic finish; for to him the English language was not a mere vehicle; it was a precious vessel. And this scholar, this thinker, this artist, had a lofty and noble and ardent and generous nature; and with all his intellectual endowment and all his stores of learning, he would not have worked to so much purpose, if his whole being had not been filled with the love of all that was high and a scorn of all that was base. To have known him is to have shared his enthusiasms. To express what it is to have lost him would require the language of an earlier world than ours.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Bevier (L.) Brief Greek syntax. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1903. 108 pp. 12mo, cl., 90 c.

Bonner (Rob. J.) Greek composition for schools; with exercises based on *Anabasis*, 1-3. Chicago, *Scott, Foresman & Co.*, 1903. 8+248 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.

Curtius Rufus (Quintus). Bk. 7 (chapters IX-XIV); ed. for the use of schools, with introd. notes and vocabulary, by C. J. Phillips. New York, *Macmillan*, 1903. 23+79 pp. 16mo, cl., 40 c. net.

Hilprecht (Hermann Vollrat). Explorations in Bible lands during the 19th century by H. V. H; with the cooperation of Dr. Benziger, Dr. Hommel, Dr. Jensen and Dr. Steindorff. Philadelphia, *A. J. Holman & Co.*, 1903. 24+859 pp. 8vo, cl., \$3 net.

Homer. *Odyssey*. Bks. 19-24; by W. W. Merry, D. D. pt. 1. Introduction and text. New York, *Oxford University Press* (American Branch), 1902. 16mo, cl., 75 c.

— The song of Demeter and her daughter Persephone, an Homeric hymn; Walter Pater's translation. Chicago, *Ralph Fletcher Seymour*, 1902. 72 pp. 32mo, cl., \$3. 400 copies on paper; 10 copies on vellum.

Martialis (M. Valerius). *Epigrammata selecta*. Secundum recognitionem W. M. Lindsay. New York, *Oxford University Press* (American Branch), 1903. No regular paging. 12mo, flex. cl., 90 c.

Nepos (Cornelius); ed. by Herbert Wilkinson. New York, *Macmillan*, 1903. 13+135 pp. 16mo, 40 c. net.

Oxford English Dictionary; ed. by J. A. H. Murray. Reissue. Vol. IV. pts. 44, 45. F-FETLOCKED. Pap., ea., 90 c.

Timotheos. *Die Perser*. Hrsg. v. Ulrich v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1903. 126 pp. pl. 8vo, cl., \$1.20 net.

— *Der Timotheos-papyrus*. Lichtdruck-Ausgabe. New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1903. 16 pp.+7 pl. fol. cl., \$4 net.

FRENCH.

Godefroy (F.) *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française du XI^e au XV^e siècle*. Tome X. Paris, 1903. 4to. 55 fr. Fin.—Vol. I-IX à 50 fr.

Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes, auctoritate et impensis academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum collectae et editae. Tomus

I, fasc. 2 et tom. III, fasc. 2. Curavit R. Cagnat. Lex. 8vo, Paris, (Rue Bonaparte 28), *E. Leroux*. I, 2. Auxiliante *J. Toutain*. (S. 129-192.) 1903. 1.20 fr. III, 2. Auxiliante *G. Lafaye*. (S. 137-272.) 1903. 2.40 fr.

GERMAN.

Äschylos. Die Schutzflehenden. Mit Einleitg. u. Anmerkgn. v. N. Wecklein. (iii, 120 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1902. m. 1.60; geb. m. 2.

Beiträge, Bonner, zur Anglistik. Hrsg. v. M. Trautmann. 7. Heft. gr. 8. Bonn, *P. Hanstein*. 7. Trautmann (Mor.) Finn u. Hildebrand. (viii, 131 S.) 1903. m. 4.50.

— Münchener, zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. H. Breymann u. J. Schick. 26-28. Heft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *A. Deichert Nachf.* 26. Holl (Fritz). Das politische u. religiöse Tendenzdrama des 16. Jahr. in Frankreich. (xxvi, 219 S.) 1903. m. 5.50. 27. Kroder (Armin). Shelley's Verskunst. (xviii, 242 S.) 1903. m. 5.50. 28. Triwunatz (Milosch). Budé's De l'institution du prince. (xv, 108 S.) 1903. m. 2.80.

Brockelmann (Carl). Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur. 2. Bd. (xi, 714 S.) gr. 8. Berlin, *E. Felber*, 1902. m. 30.

Columellae (L.) Iuni Moderati, opera quae exstant recensuit Vilelm. Lundström. Fasc. VI. gr. 8. Upsaliae. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. m. 1.50. VI. Rei rusticae liber decimus (carmen de cultu hortorum). (vi, 23 S.) 1902. m. 1.50.

Englert (A.) Die Rhythmik Fischarts. (viii, 99 S.) gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1903. m. 4.

Forschungen, anglistische. Hrsg. v. Johs. Hoops. 12. Heft. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter, Verl.* 12. Jordan (Rich.) Die altenglischen Säugetiernamen, zusammengestellt und erläutert. (xii, 212 S.) 1903. m. 6.

Fürst (J.) Die litterarische Portraitmanier im Bereich des griechisch-römischen Schrifttums. [Aus: „Philologus“.] (100 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1902. m. 2.40.

Gellii (A.) Noctium atticarum libri XX. Post Mart. Hertz ed. Carol. Hosius. Vol. I. (lxiv, 378 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1903. m. 3.60; geb. m. 4.20.

Helten (W. L. van). Die altostniederfränkischen Psalmenfragmente, u. s. w. 1. Tl. Die Grammatiken. (iv, u. S. 117-222). gr. 8. Groningen, *J. B. Wolters*, 1902. m. 3.50.

Isaac (S.) Homiliae. Edidit P. Bedjan. (In syrischer Sprache.) Tom. I. Paris u. Leipzig, 1903. 8. xxii, 855 pp. m. 26.

Menge (Herm.) Griechisch-deutsches Schul-Wörterbuch. (In 8 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. (xii, u. S. 1-80.) Lex. 8. Berlin, *Langenscheidt's Verl.*, 1903. m. 75.

Palaestra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl, Gust. Roethe u. Erich Schmidt. XXVII. gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. XXVII. Brie (Frdr. W. D.) Eulenspiegel in England. (vii, 151 S.) 1903. m. 4.80.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitg., hrsg. v. Geo. Wissowa. Suppl. 1. Heft. (vii S. u. Sp. 1-374.) gr. 8. Stuttgart, *J. B. Metzler*, 1903. m. 5.

Pick (Herm.) Assyrisches u. Talmudisches. (33 S.) gr. 8. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1903. m. 1.50.

Pognon (H.) Une version syriaque des aphorismes d'Hippocrate. Texte et traduction. 1. partie. Texte syriaque. (xl, 32 S.) hoch 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*, 1903. m. 12.

Prosopographia Attica. Ed. Ioa. Kirchner. Vol. II. (vii, 660 S.) gr. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1903. m. 28.

Saemundar Edda, m. e. Anh. Hrsg. u. erkl. v. F. Detter u. R. Heinzel. 2 Bde. (xv, 213 u. viii, 679 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, *G. Wigand*, 1903. m. 30.

Schmidt (Max C. P.) Altphilologische Beiträge. 1. Heft. Horaz-Studien. (viii, 82 S.) 8. Leipzig, *Dürr'sche Buchh.*, 1903. m. 1.20.

Thucydidis historiae recensuit Carol. Hude. Vol. II. Libri V-VIII. Ed. minor. (324 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1903. m. 1.20; geb. m. 1.80.

Sycz (S.) Ursprung u. Wiedergabe der biblischen Eigennamen im Koran (64 S.) gr. 8. Frankfurt a/M., *J. Kauffmann*, 1903. m. 2.

Vogel (Ernst). Zur Flexion des englischen Verbums im XI. u. XII. Jahrh. (iv, 70 S.) gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1903. m. 1.60.

ITALIAN.

Eschilo. I sette a Tebe, con note di Vigilio Inama. Torino. 8vo, p. 124. L. 2.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Addresses delivered at the formal opening of The Semitic Museum of Harvard University. Feb. 5, 1903.

'Αρβανιτόπουλος (Α. Σ.) 'Ο ἐφηβος τῶν Ἀντικυθέρων. ἐν Ἀθήναις. Τυπογραφεῖον Ἑστία, 1903.

Arnold (Matthew). Essays on the Study of Poetry as a guide to English literature. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1903.

Bréal (Michel). Un problème de l'histoire littéraire.

Bretzel (Hugo). Botanische Forschungen des Alexanderzuges. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1903.

Burney (C. F.) Notes on the Hebrew Text of the First Book of Kings. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. MDCCCII. 14s.

Ciceros Rede für Murena. Erkl. v. O. Drenckhahn. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1903. 1 m.

— Philosophische Schriften. Auswahl für Schulen, von Theodor Schiche. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1903. 1 m. 80 pf.

Diels (Hermann). Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch u. Deutsch. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1903. 15 m.

Dörwald (Paul). Griechischer Wortschatz. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1903. 2 m.

Ellis (Robinson). The Commonitorium of Orientius. A Lecture. London, *James Parker & Son*, 1903. 1s.

Euripides' Hippolyt. Für d. Schulgebr., herausg. von Oskar Altenburg. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. 1903. geb. 1 m.

Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfelds sechzigstem Geburtstag. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte u. Griechisch-Römischen Alterthumskunde. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1903. 20 m.

Hammond (W. A.) Aristotle's Psychology. A Treatise on the Principle of Life. (De Anima and Parva Naturalia.) Translated with Introduction and Notes. London, *Swan Sonnenschein & Co.* New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1902.

Helbig (W.) Les Ἰππεῖς Athéniens. Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tome XXXVII. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1902. 5 fr.

Heinze (Richard). Vergils Epische Technik. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1903.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. C. Robert. XXXVIII. Band. 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1903.

Horton (George). In Argolis (illustrated). Chicago, *A. C. McClurg & Co.*, 1902. \$1.75.

Huxley (Henry Minor). Syrian Songs, Proverbs and Stories; collected translated and annotated. From the Journal of the Am. Or. Society. Vol XXIII, 1902, pp. 175-288.

James (W.) and Molé (A.) Dictionary of the French and English Languages. Completely rewritten and greatly enlarged by Louis Tolhausen and George Payn, assisted by E. Heymann. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1903.

Kemmer (E.) Die polare Ausdrucksweise in der griechischen Literatur. Beiträge zur Historischen Syntax der Griechischen Sprache. Herausg. v. M. v. Schanz. Heft 15. Würzburg, *A. Stuber's Verlag*, 1903. 6 m.

Kersten (W.) Zwanzig Colloquia Familiaria des Erasmus von Rotterdam. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1903. 1 m.

Laussac (Le Colonel). Mnémotechnie des racines allemandes. Paris, *A. Fontemoing*, 1903. 6 fr.

Manly (W. G.) Ithaca or Leucas? University of Missouri Studies. Vol. II. No. 1. (Columbia, Mo.). University of Missouri. April, 1903. \$1.

Maryland Geological Survey. Allegany County Atlas. Cecil County and Atlas. Garrett County and Atlas. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1902.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Ed. by James A. H. Murray. Onomastical-Outing. (Vol. VII). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. \$1.25.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. Deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. VI. Jahrg., 1903. XI. u. XII. 3. Heft. Leipzig, 1903.

Pascal (Carlo). Studi critici sul poema di Lucrezio. Roma, *Albrighi, Segati e C.*, 1903.

Penick (D. L.) Herodotos in the Greek Renaissance. (J. H. U. Diss.). Baltimore, *John Murphy Co.*, 1902.

Philon de Byzance. Le livre des appareils pneumatiques et des machines hydrauliques. Édité d'après les versions arabes et traduit en Français par le Baron Cana de Vaux. Tiré des notices et extraits des MSS de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques. Tome XXXVIII. Paris, *C. Klincksieck*. MDCCCXCII. 8 fr. 50 c.

Pichon (René). De Sermone amatorio apud Latinos Elegiarum Scriptores (Thesis).

— Lactance, Étude sur le mouvement philosophique et religieux sous le règne de Constantin. (Thèse.) Paris, *Hachette et C^{ie}*, 1901.

Radford (R. S.) Personification and the use of Abstract Subjects in the Attic orators and Thukydides. Part I. (J. H. U. Diss.) Baltimore, 1901.

Schmidtke (Alfred). Die Evangelien eines alten Unzialcodex (BN-Text). Nach einer Abschrift des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts. Herausg. v. A. S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs*, 1903. 4 m.

Timotheos. Die Perser. Aus einem Papyrus von Abusir im Auftrage der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft herausg. v. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Mit einer Lichtdrucktarfel. 1903.

— Der Timotheos-Papyrus. Lichtdruck-Ausgabe. New York, *Lemcke & Büchner*, 1903.

Weil (Henri). Études de littérature et de rythmique grecques. Paris, *Hachette & C^{ie}*, 1902.